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Review comments

General comments

This is a study of relevance for primary healthcare in Hungary other countries where complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) use is widespread. The cultural perspective to this paper is great.

The study was well organized and the paper well presented. There are however issues that need to be addressed and these have been indicated below.

Abstract

Results

"In order to avoid the dichotomization of "push and pull factors," results were structured along milestones of the patient journey" - Where these also based on in-depth interviews conducted with patients (N = 9) and practitioners (N=9)? The clarification need to be made.

Conclusion

There is a disconnect between the results and the conclusion sections. The conclusions should be based on the results obtained.

Background

1. Correct the first sentence of the background - Although a myriad of surveys support complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) is becoming increasingly popular among European and North American populations

2. The authors should indicate the source of this information about Ghana - but 70% of the Ghana population cannot afford Western medicine
3. The background is generally silent on CULTURALLY EMBEDDED FACTORS IN COMPLEMENTARY AND ALTERNATIVE MEDICINE USE as it pertains to other studies. The authors did well by indicating what has generally been reported on CAM and Traditional Chinese Medicine in other countries but are unable to clearly indicate what exact cultural issues exist.

Methods

1. Please move the information on the mean age to the results section.

2. The section on the Sociocultural context of research is very lengthy. Some of the information should be moved to the background and specific information relating to the methodology should be stated.

3. The methods section need to include details of the in-depth interviews as well. So far emphasis has been on the patient observation. The authors should include information on the interview guide and the observation checklist.

Results

It is not clear from the results which information was obtained from the patient observation, from the interviews and that from the practitioners.

Discussion

The authors did a good work by discussing their findings in relation to pertinent literature. However, the narratives on the exact quotations from the interviews should be moved to the results section and not be part of the discussions.

Conclusion

The conclusion is too long. The authors should just concentrate on the main findings and the implications of such observations.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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