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This paper is much improved. I suggest that the authors make the following (compulsory) revisions in order that the paper be ready for publication.

1) The first few introductory paras are messy. They should be in the following form:

- what is EBM?
- why is it important for CAM?
- what needs to happen for CAM to accept EBM?

These issues do not require more than a sentence or two.

2) Confidence intervals are reported, but not for the difference between groups.

3) The author seems to suggest the ANCOVA could not be used because
appropriate information was not taken. I find this hard to believe. A baseline score was taken and can be entered into a regression model along with group as the predictor variable and final score as the dependent variable. Looking at their data I think highly unlikely that ANCOVA would affect the results so I don't think it would be a problem if the authors retained the ttests. However, the authors need to report the ttest data more conventionally. The figures containing print out from the statistics package are a little silly. There is no need for all the stuff about equality of variance etc.

4) The first few paras of the discussion need to be rewritten. In particular, the lengthy quotes seem meaningless and out of place.
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