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Reviewer Comment:
This is manuscript by the authors on a cross sectional study of Prevalence and Correlates of Complementary and Alternative Medicine Use among Diabetic patients in Beirut, Lebanon: A cross-sectional study
The authors have done good job writing the manuscript. I believe this manuscript deserves to be published as it presents a potential interaction on the use of complementary alternative medicine among patient with diabetes in the world.
Specific comments:
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   -Please elaborate further on the sampling method and sample size calculation used in this study
3. Are the data sound?
   -Can the author categorize the CAM use in this study as the term of CAM use generally is too broad. Please refer to the paper on “Complementary alternative medicine use among patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus in the primary care setting: a cross-sectional study in Malaysia.”
   - In discussing about the diabetes duration as of the predictor use, one of the explanation could be self empowerment. Because of this, patients tend to try CAM to optimize their health status so that they feel that they have partially contributed to the management of their disease.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
My opinion on the policy and practice recommendation part might be not relevant here as this is not the population survey and not done at the national level. Suggest author to commend that further study with a larger scale needed to be conducted in the future based on the limitation mentioned in the manuscript.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   - How about the paper on CAM use Complementary alternative medicine use among patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus in the primary care setting: a cross-sectional study in Malaysia.
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? yes Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

**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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