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Reviewer's report:

General

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

None

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Please ensure that tenses match throughout. At times the authors describe the subjects' views in the past tense and sometimes in the present tense. This is confusing.
I assume that copy editors will correct spelling and punctuation errors.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

In "The CAM Practitioner Groups" section, the authors say their focus is on those practitioner groups whose scope of practice is "completely dependent" on their ability to use NHPs. This is a bit of an overstatement. Many TCM practitioners rely much more on acupuncture; naturopaths rely on a variety of treatments, as described by the authors.

Similarly, "we are confident we were successful in recruiting all of the key CAM leaders in Canada" claims an extraordinary degree of confidence. Might be changed to ".. we are confident that we recruited key CAM leaders whose opinions reflect professional opinions about the new regulations" See? Whenever readers read "all" or "none" or "completely", they become skeptical of that and future claims. Better not to raise red flags unnecessarily.

Because the interview questions did not address perceptions of relative power among the different kinds of CAM providers, the extensive discussion of this in the discussion is interesting but speculative. It would shorten and tighten the paper to omit this.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
**Statistical review:** No
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