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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a great article and I don't think it needs much work at all to be publishable. Comparing countries does seem to be quite novel and really interesting.

The Background is quite long - I wonder if the paragraph on classifying treatments could be shorter? Although saying that, could you add anything about how CAM is defined in the different countries and how you dealt with this? There must be quite a lot of variation in what treatments are considered CAM between all those countries.

For those not familiar with the survey could you give some more detail on methods, especially sampling/recruitment?

The section "Around 11% of the sample had used at least one physical treatment, about 9.5% had used any consumable treatment, and 2.54% had used both. This is illustrated in the Venn diagram in figure 1, however we still found significant differences in the results between the two subgroups, and therefore we kept them as is. " should surely be in Results not Methods?

If you need a recent survey from the UK our work from 2018 supports some of your points and was a high-quality survey done by Ipsos Mori https://bjgpopen.org/content/2/4/bjgpopen18X101614

I wasn’t sure if you had referred to the work by the CAMBrella group which I would have thought would be useful for you? (https://cam-europe.eu/library-cam/cambrella-research-reports)
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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