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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

I want to congratulate the authors on a good topical area specific to Northern Norway. There is definitely a need to have better understanding of traditional healing and CAM among populations esp those utilizing medical pluralism. I have provided detailed comments on the actually manuscript so that authors can review comments, so will not repeat but will provide high level summary.

Overall good topic, data extracted from existing survey study and focus on those participants that indicated use of TH/CAM. The highlight of the study is being able to acquire data on such a large cohort of participants.

The background and literature review provided sufficient information however there were certain content that was either irrelevant, unnecessary or repetitive.

Methods section seem to describe the main study in which data was obtained but unsure of exact inclusion and exclusion of participants in addition, what is the Study design? Cross sectional? Also it seems participants are self selected based on their interest to participate from larger study.

Need to remove the wording "somewhat". Details on clinical exam, etc. but this is not relevant to this analysis or study.

Was difficulty following the results and table 1 is has too much information and could benefit from being broken into 2 or 3 other tables for ease of interpreting. Tables 1.2, 1.3...1/13 (missing?) were mentioned but did not have them in document or as attachments. Table 1 has some discrepancies in total numbers that needs to be sorted (see notations)

The final conclusion statement is very weak for such an important topic, what can be done given what has been found from the study--provider education, policy, more research, comparison to other regions on Norway??

Authors should revisit this manuscript with fresh pair of eyes and revision to aid the reader in better appreciating the study that has been performed. And editing services should be utilized.

Discussion had some results (first paragraph) which needs to be relocated. Since results section was unorganized and difficult to follow, this also make discussion also unmanageable. It is the norm to present participant demographics first, univariate information then bivariate etc.
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.

Unable to assess

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

Unable to assess

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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