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Reviewer's report:

The authors have made several helpful modifications to this manuscript. I still however, have concerns.

Major Issues:

The results of this study suggest that patients who choose care from NT practitioners report higher scores on several items of the EUROPEP instrument than do those patients who choose to receive care from conventional primary care practitioners. This is a reasonable conclusion from this study and is of interest. My concern is that the authors fail, in my opinion, to clearly indicate that these findings do not suggest that NT care is superior to conventional care. For example, in the discussion the authors state, “...consideration difference in treatment frequencies indicates a particular attractiveness of NT.” This statement is not supported by the findings, i.e. it is not clear why additional visits were used. Later in paragraph 1 of discussion the authors state this study provides “empirical evidence that ...NT may lower the socio economic burden.” Once again, this is not justified by the present study.

In the limitations section the authors suggest that motivation of physicians may have an influence on the findings. This is also not supported.

The clinical implications are not supported. Higher scores on the EUROPEP do not justify the inclusion of NT in primary care without additional, causal, evidence. Could the increased satisfaction have occurred from the longer time spent with the patient and not the actual treatment?

Minor issues:

It would be helpful to give a brief overview of the EUROPEP instrument and its psychometric properties.

It would also be helpful to give a rationale for the choice of statistical tests that were used.

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

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

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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