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**Reviewer's report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions

I agree to the authors that CAM is philosophically more appropriate than TM. In this study, however, there is no evidence of superiority of CAM to TM. I suppose consistency across components may illustrate the reliability of CAM measure.

I am interested what are the characteristics of patients who met criteria for CAM but not for TM. Comparison between characteristics of TM and CAM is, as the authors mentioned, not so attractive.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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