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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript delineate traditional healing practice in Bangladesh, using a qualitative approach including semi-structured interviews and participatory observation. The manuscript is interesting and include a lot of data and information. However, that the paper needs more structure and information about how the data was collected needs to be clarified.

I have the following major concerns:

1. In order to make the paper more focused, my suggestion is to take the data from the patients out of the manuscript and just include data obtained form the traditional healers. Data obtained form from the patients should be a separate paper.

2. The manuscript should have a separate paragraph where traditional healing is put into a theoretical context such as "medical pluralism" or "resilience".

3. Define Complementary and Alternative Medicine and Traditional Medicine. Is Traditional Medicine understood as a part of CAM in Bangladesh?

4. The objective and research questions are unclear, pleas revise. On page 7, first paragraph, sentence starting with The main focus of the study..... explain the objectives. Please remove to end of page 5.

Use one terminology for conventional medicine. One terminology for the patients ( 

4. The method section should include the following subheadings:

a) Design: Explaining the rationale for using a qualitative approach in this study, include references

b) Participants and recruitment: Describe the participants according to table 2 and how the participants were recruited, including where the interviews took place. Describe in detail where the participatory observation took place and the researcher who performed these observations. Include a map in order to identify these areas.
c) Semi-structured interviews: Describe this method and the rationale for using the design in this study. Include references.

d) Participatory observation: Describe the rationale for using this design and include the references.

e) The Interview guide: How was the interview guide developed (sources for the interview guide). Provide a table with the questions included in the guide.

f) Ethical considerations.

How was the consent obtained from the participants?

Please do not include any results in the method section. Remove the following to the result section or delete: Page 6: Initially, the traditional healers perceived..... Page 7: however, some of the traditional healers were reluctant to......

e) Data analysis: Describe what kind of analysis was used in the process. Did you use direct or indirect content analysis? Include references. How was the theme, sub-them, and codes identified. At the end of this section you should state the theme identified.

Result section:

Please organize the results according to the themes identified. Reelictions about your finding should be removed to the discussion or be deleted e.g. Prevention and illness page 26.

Discussion should include the following:

1. A short summary of your findings

2. Other studies: Discuss your findings according to other studies.

3. Theoretical framework. Discuss your finding according to theory

4. Methodological aspects/Limitations: Include the issues of conducting research in own culture (if this is the case) or other limitations. Describe the researchers. Include references

5. Implications for further research and practice.

Please delete 1 paragraph page 25, repetition.

Please remove page 31, as it is repetitions.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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