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Reviewer’s report:

General
Overall, the paper is great and deserved publication.

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

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)

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

1. I think that the response rate should be discussed further. I would suggest use of articles cited in Berman, B., Singh, B.B. et al, which was a nationwide survey or other more recent ones indicating the difficulty in getting PCPs to comply with mailed surveys. I realize that this is a regional sample and the Berman, B., Singh, B.K., et al article was cited. But, response rate was not as critical in this paper as it was not a probability sample, it was a pilot survey and utilized an accidental sampling technique.

Also, the literature concerning the acceptability of less than target sample sizes when the respondents are of a homogeneous group, particularly a group similarly professionally trained is found in the nationwide paper.


Coulter, Singh, Riley and DerMartirosian published an article concerning referral patterns among conventional members of an IPA and 2 CAM practitioner categories who were part of the IPA plan--Chiropractors and AOM practitioners. You may want to cite it as this article does not use the reference and says that such articles are indeed hard to locate. Coulter, I.D., Singh, B.B., Riley, D., Der-Martirosian, C. Interprofessional Referral Patterns in an Integrated Medical System, Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapies, Vol. 28, no. 3, 2005.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1. I would suggest a grammar check or have someone outside the set of authors read the manuscript to identify a few awkward sentences.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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