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Reviewer's report:

General
The use of natural health products by the general public has been an issue of concern to healthcare authorities in the Western World for the past 1-2 decades. It is a controversial issue as far as the appropriate ways to approach this problem in a way that is acceptable to consumers on one hand and addressing quality and safety issues on the other.

This article comes to address the new Canadian initiative to control this use and how CAM practitioners perceive the impact of such regulation on their practice, an issue that was not dealt in the past. The study is well defined and the methods of obtaining the data were appropriate and well described with sufficient details. There are a few deficiencies that need to be addressed prior to having this article published.

1. For the reader that is coming from out of Canada, there is a need to describe a bit more in detail the NHP regulations. Its not clear how the regulations constructed and what is the basis for approving or disapproving each product, is it based on current literature, The German Commission E, online sources etc. How do they differentiate between the commercial companies as far as content and quality, will they test each product? How are the regulations going to be implemented, who is going to enforce those regulations, are they going to have a “herbal police” that is going to go around the different health food stores? All those issues are not clear from the manuscript and have a significant effect on how we analyze the results.

2. Even though the authors put in their objectives to evaluate the impact on CAM practitioners’ involvement with the public as a result of the implementation of these regulations, I could not find a mention to this effect in the results or the discussion.

3. The theoretical framework in the introduction appears to be cumbersome and I would probably delete it to keep a clear reading flow.

4. The discussion is too long and needs to be shortened and clear.

5. Some of the statements that are mentioned in the discussion are not based on findings that are mentioned in the results, at times it seems that the authors mix those two sections and you see new facts, results and findings being presented in the discussion section.

As noted above

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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