

## Reviewer's report

**Title:** Anthroposophic medical therapy in chronic disease: a four-year prospective cohort study

**Version: 2 Date:** 5 December 2006

**Reviewer:** Marianne A Ch Carlsson

### Reviewer's report:

#### General

This is an interesting study, but some points should be clarified. My main point concern the research questions or aim of the study. The aim could be reformulated, see below It could be interesting to show the outcome of this prospective study, but only in a descriptive way and then the anthroposophic therapies should be described in more details.

-----  
**Major Compulsory Revisions** (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The aim was to describe clinical outcomes after an initial prolonged consultation. All patients got this prolonged consultation time and they also got individualized anthroposophic therapy. The study had a prospective design with measurements at baseline and then 2-6 additional times, which was good. The overall result showed improvement from baseline to the other measurement points. You (= the authors) concluded that prolonged consultation time gave long term reduction of chronic disease symptoms. But this is not possible to say from this study. There is no comparison group with shorter consultation time. Since there is no comparison groups it is not possible to tell if anthroposophic therapy is as good as conventional medicine or as spontaneous recovery. But it could be interesting to show the outcome of this prospective study, but only in a descriptive way and then the anthroposophic therapies should be described in more details.

-----  
**Minor Essential Revisions** (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The article was easy to read and understand and since my first language is not English I do not comment on the language.

-----  
**Discretionary Revisions** (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.