Reviewer's report

Title: Surveying Canadian regulated complementary and alternative medicine schools: Facts and fiction about research, evidence-based health care and interprofessional training, as well as continuing education

Version: 1 Date: 6 September 2013

Reviewer: Martina Kadmon

Reviewer's report:

The present article addresses the extent to which aspects of evidence-based patient care, research methods, interpretation and integration of research data, interprofessional encounters during training and aspects of continuous education are integrated in the curricula of Canadian CAM Schools.

The issue is principally an important one since more and more patients seek help in CAM and conventional care providers at the same time.

The introduction states the major data on the topic available and presents the conceptual framework of the study. However, the title of manuscript raises expectations that are not fulfilled (where is the fiction?). The methodology is clear and seems adequate. Overall, results and discussion are well presented, but require a some major adaptations, especially a critical analysis of the results and resulting future demands and conclusions. Some major flaws should be addressed before publication may be recommended.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

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

2. Background:

In the description of the background the reader gets a clear idea of the immediate research question of the study, i.e. the analysis of the status quo concerning aspects of evidence-based patient care, research methods, interpretation and integration of research data, interprofessional encounters during training and continuous education in the curricula of Canadian CAM Schools. But could the authors elaborate on their ultimate goal? Is it to offer needs assessment for future curriculum development? Is it to promote the question why alternative therapies that lack evidence are taught in Canadian Regulated CAM Schools? Or is it to promote interprofessional education as a means of higher patient safety?

3. Methods:

The method section is altogether clear. But could the authors specify whether the pilot testing was integrated in or excluded from the analysis. And could they, please, specify on their content analysis (Criteria for coding etc.). Why discussion
with the second author and not independent coding?

4. Results:
I suggest to the authors to include the characterization of CAM-schools on page 9 and 10 in an additional table for easier reading.
The numbers given in the text and the numbers in table 2 seem to differ. The numbers in the table do not add up to the numbers given in the text.

5. Discussion:
At the beginning of the discussion the authors state that most Canadian regulated CAM schools offered research methods and evidence-based health care training etc. However, considering the low response rate on the one hand and the actual results on the other, this conclusion should be critically revised. The authors should also point out the limitations of the study on the basis of the low response rate.
Could the authors, please, also elaborate on how they interpret the fact that everyone seemed more or less satisfied and yet everyone wanted to improve the curricula with respect to the evidence-based medicine contents.
The conclusion seems altogether a bit week and should be strengthened.

Minor Essential Revisions:

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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