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Reviewer #1 Comments
This article has been substantially improved from the first draft. I particularly like the thoughtful and wise strategy that is outlined in the discussion. The discussion is a little long but nevertheless it covers the multitude of points raised by both reviewers in a very constructive and coherent way. It lays a thoughtful and considered foundation for future outcome research in integrated healthcare and now clearly defines (with appropriate strengths and limitations) many of the issues involved.

One can always find fault with a paper, particularly in an area such as integrated healthcare which is "emergent". However, I think the authors have done an excellent and very thoughtful job in their response to reviewers. I think it is a really important paper that lays a coherent methodological and indeed very practical foundation for future research in this increasingly important field. This paper addresses an important topic and contributes to moving integrative health care from simply being conceptualised as to its nature to being evaluated for its effectiveness. Consistency in the use of terminology and clear definitions for the terms used in this paper will greatly enhance its intelligibility.

We thank the reviewer for the thoughtful and kind comments. We are pleased that we have been able to address the reviewer's concerns raised previously.

Reviewer #2 Comments
I am satisfied that the authors have responded to my concerns and the paper is suitable for publication. The argument is now cohesive and, although the Discussion is still lengthy, the key messages are easier to follow.

We are pleased that we have been able to address the reviewer's concerns raised previously. We thank the reviewer for close attention to detail and we have addressed all the minor language revisions listed suggested below. Where there we differed from the reviewer's advice we have made note.

Minor essential revisions (including language revisions):
1. p3 second last line from the bottom: Change to '... physician may be the
gatekeeper and the CM practitioner as an aduct...

2. p4 third paragraph first line: Change 'way' to 'ways'

3. p4 third paragraph fifth line: Insert 'therapy' after complementary

4. p5 Method second line: (NICM) should appear after the 'National Institute of Complementary Medicine' and then the reference should follow in this case just the year.

5. p5 Method fourth line: Correct citation is required.

6. p5 last sentence. Change to '... excluded if they were not transferrable to a Western setting due to the different infrastructures in non-Western settings (e.g. Chinese medicine in China' or similar.

7. p6 second paragraph second line: Second sentence needs a verb. Change 'being' to 'was'.

8. p7. Third paragraph second line. 'The' missing before 'final decision'.

9. p7. Third paragraph fourth line. Full stop after 'entireity' and capital for 'Data'.

10. p8. Second paragraph second line: Table One should be Table 1.


12. p10. First line: Insert 'of the patient' after 'eligibility'

13. p10. Second paragraph first line: Change 'consult' to 'consultation'

14. p10 Third paragraph first sentence: Move 'to the study' to immediately after 'accepted'

15. p10 Last paragraph third line: Full stop after 'case manager' and capital for 'The'

16. p11 Second paragraph: Sentence beginning 'Sunberg' should follow immediately after 'plan' (not a new paragraph).

17. p12 Second paragraph. Sentence beginning Maiers et al should follow immediately after 'both' (not a new paragraph).

18. p12 Second paragraph: This is the first reference to MYMOP in the text and should be written out in full first time it's used. Then on p13 second last line, just use the abbreviation.

19. p12 Third paragraph: Insert details of studies referred to.

20. p14 First paragraph second last line: No need for (QoL) unless used later.

21. p14 Second paragraph last line. Could the authors provide brief detail about cost effectiveness in the other study referred to. The other study has published results but no data on cost was published.

22. p15 Second paragraph. Insert citations to the studies referred to in this paragraph.

23. p15 Second paragraph second line: Delete 'a higher'

24. p15 Second paragraph third line: Replace 'they' with 'the authors' or similar
25. p15 Second paragraph second last line: Inserting 'bias' before 'because' might help the readability of this sentence.
26. p15 Third paragraph second line: Delete 'designed' and change 'using' to 'used'
27. p15 Third paragraph third line: Some words missing from this sentence
28. p16 First line: Insert citation to the two studies referred to here.
29. p16 Second paragraph: Sentence beginning 'Although ... ’ is not a sentence. This sentence has been amended to read: “One study provided the following rationale: ‘a 12 week intervention period was perceived by study clinicians and investigators to be typical when treating this population’.”
30. p20 First paragraph sixth line: For the reader's sake, Bell could be followed by the citation again.
31. p20 Second paragraph last line: Could be something else entirely
32. p21 Second last paragraph fourth line from bottom: Insert citation immediately after Jonas et al.
33. p22 First paragraph fourth line: Delete 'as necessary'
34. p23 First paragraph fourth line from the bottom: Insert 'is' 'conversely it is thought ... '
35. p23 Second last line: Delete ‘of’