

An International, Cross-Sectional Survey of Cardiology Researchers and Clinicians: Perceptions of Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Medicine

Short Title: Cardiology Researcher & Clinician CAIM Perceptions

Jeremy Y. Ng, MSc, PhD^{1,2§}; Mehvish Masood, BMSc^{1,2}; Sivany Kathir^{1,2}; Holger Cramer, PhD^{1,2}

¹ Institute of General Practice and Interprofessional Care, University Hospital Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

² Robert Bosch Center for Integrative Medicine and Health, Bosch Health Campus, Stuttgart, Germany

[§] Corresponding Author Details

Email: ngjy2@mcmaster.ca or jeremy.ng@med.uni-tuebingen.de

Address: Institute of General Practice and Interprofessional Care, University Hospital Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

ORCiDs:

JYN: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0031-5873>

MM: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-2549-3573>

SK: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-4183-4327>

HC: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3640-8046>

Total Manuscript Word Count: 4243

Abstract

Background: Complementary, alternative, and integrative medicine (CAIM) has been increasing in popularity for patients with cardiovascular illnesses. However, little is known about perceptions of CAIM among cardiology researchers and clinicians. In response, this study aimed to assess the practices, perceptions, and attitudes towards CAIM among cardiology researchers and clinicians.

Methods: An anonymous, digital cross-sectional survey was administered to researchers and clinicians who have published articles in cardiology journals indexed in OVID MEDLINE. The survey was sent to 37,915 researchers and clinicians and included 5-point Likert scales, multiple-choice questions, and open-ended questions. Basic descriptive statistics were drawn from quantitative data, and a thematic content analysis was conducted to analyze open-ended responses.

Results: Among the 309 respondents, the majority (n=173, 55.99%) identified themselves as both researchers and clinicians in the field of cardiology. While 45.78% (n=114) of participants expressed agreement regarding the safety of CAIM therapies, 44.40% (n=111) disagreed on their efficacy. Most respondents believed in the value of conducting research on CAIM therapies (79.2%, n=198). Respondents perceived mind-body therapies (57.61%, n=159) and biologically based practices (47.46%, n=131) as the most promising interventions for the prevention and treatment of cardiovascular conditions. Biofield therapies were the least favoured for integration into mainstream medical practices (11.93%, n=29).

Conclusions: While cardiology researchers and clinicians perceive CAIM therapies to have potential, many are hesitant about integrating such interventions into the current medical system

due to a perceived lack of scientific evidence and standardized products. Insights from this study may help establish educational resources for healthcare practitioners.

Keywords: complementary, alternative and integrative medicine; cardiology; mind-body therapies, biologically based practices, manipulation and body-based practices, biofield therapy; whole medical systems; perceptions

Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms

CAM: complementary and alternative medicine

CAIM: complementary, alternative, and integrative medicine

CVD: cardiovascular disease

MEDLINE: Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online

NLM: National Library of Medicine

OSF: Open Science Framework

PMIDs: PubMed Identifiers

STROBE: Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology

Clinical Perspective

What is New?

- While complementary, alternative, and integrative medicine (CAIM) therapies are generally perceived by cardiology professionals as being safe and as having multiple potential benefits, there remains a strong need for additional research and training on CAIM interventions.

- In this study, support for CAIM therapies varied by modality, with mind-body therapies and biologically based practices garnering the most favor and biofield therapies garnering the least.

What Are the Clinical Implications?

- Given the rising demand for CAIM interventions and the significance of lifestyle factors for cardiac conditions, there is a critical need for cardiology professionals to access CAIM-based research and education to meet patients' needs.

Introduction

Cardiology is the medical specialty that focuses on the analysis, diagnosis, and treatment of disorders related to the heart and the circulatory system. Cardiology researchers and clinicians investigate a wide range of conditions, including congenital heart defects, cardiac inflammation (e.g., myocarditis), and cardiovascular diseases (CVDs; e.g., coronary heart disease and peripheral arterial disease).¹⁻³ CVDs have garnered heightened attention because of their status as the leading cause of deaths worldwide, accounting for approximately half of noncommunicable disease mortalities and over 17.9 million deaths each year.⁴⁻⁶ Similarly, congenital heart disease is the leading cause of infant death due to congenital defects worldwide, afflicting approximately 0.8% of live births.^{7,8} In response to these critical health challenges, numerous advancements in conventional medicine have emerged. This includes developments in medications (e.g., beta-blockers, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors), surgery (e.g., coronary bypass, aortic valve replacements), nanotechnology, and cardiac rehabilitation programs.⁹⁻¹⁴ However, while proven to be effective, the significant emotional, physical, and financial toll of these therapeutics often makes patients increasingly adverse to their usage.¹⁵⁻¹⁸ Medications, for instance, have been reported to have adverse side effects such as rhabdomyolysis, angioedema, upper respiratory symptoms, and hyperkalaemia.¹⁸⁻²¹ Similarly, surgeries such as coronary artery bypass grafts and bariatric surgery are known to be both expensive and inaccessible.^{22,23} Furthermore, patients have been reported to be in search of therapeutics that address not only the physical and biochemical manifestations of illness but also the emotional, social, and spiritual context of disease.^{24,25} As a consequence, patients may view complementary, alternative, and integrative medicine (CAIM) as a viable therapeutic alternative.

According to the US National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health, CAIM is characterized by a diverse array of non-mainstream practices that work *together with* (i.e., complementary approaches), *in place of* (i.e., alternative approaches), or *in coordination with* (i.e., integrative approaches) conventional medicine.^{26,27} This involves, but is not limited to, the use of mind-body therapies (e.g., meditation), biologically based practices (e.g., vitamins), manipulative and body-based practices (e.g., massages), and whole medical systems (e.g., homeopathy).²⁷ Prior research has shown that an overwhelming number of individuals partake in CAIM practices. A systematic review of national studies published from 2010 to 2019 found that the reported prevalence of traditional, complementary, and alternative medicine use within the general population ranged from 24 to 71.3%.²⁸ Wood et al. found that 64% of 107 CVD patients randomly selected from a stratified cohort of 2,487 eligible participants identified themselves as using complementary and alternative medicines (CAM) such as nutritional supplements and megadose vitamins.²⁹ A cross-sectional study investigating the knowledge and use of CAM among CVD patients (n = 90) found that 63.3% of participants reported using CAM.¹⁸ A survey given to pediatric patients (or their parents/guardians) in two cardiology units found that 59.1% of patients had utilized CAM at one point in their lives, with multivitamins and massages being the most common products and practices reported, respectively.³⁰ This usage suggests that understanding such practices is necessary for aiding patients in cardiovascular settings.

Unfortunately, the divisive and polarizing nature of CAIM has limited research into its safety and usage.³¹⁻³⁴ Specifically, CAIM has been perceived as a challenge to the traditional scientific training and expertise of many physicians and researchers.³²⁻³⁴ This lack of clarity, from the viewpoints of healthcare practitioners and researchers, may prove harmful to patient outcomes.

For instance, insufficient training and insight regarding CAIM have been reported to cause healthcare staff to be ill-equipped and hesitant to provide resources or insight when approached by patients.^{25,32–35} Moreover, given that many patients rely on healthcare systems and physician appointments for information regarding treatments, providing unclear information may result in patients turning to sources that may not be credible, offering inadequate advice, or presenting ambiguous information.^{36,37} These potentially adverse consequences underscore the importance of addressing gaps in CAIM-based knowledge for researchers and clinicians.

Limited research has been conducted on the perspectives of CAIM among cardiology researchers and physicians. This has hindered the ability to determine whether CAIM-based resources are required for cardiology researchers and clinicians and, if so, what specific issues need to be addressed. In response to this gap in knowledge, this international, cross-sectional survey aims to understand how cardiology researchers and clinicians perceive CAIM. This exploration is intended to provide a more comprehensive insight into global cardiology perspectives regarding CAIM by delving into the foundations of reservations and support for such practices and exploring the mechanisms by which such views may be addressed. This study is descriptive, and there were no formal hypotheses for this study.

Methods

Transparency Statement

Clearance and approval from the University Hospital Tübingen Research Ethics Board (REB) were obtained prior to the commencement of the project (REB Number: 389/2023BO2). The study was preregistered with the Open Science Framework (OSF) and the protocol, along with

study material and raw data, can be found on OSF at <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/MQBW6>.³⁸ We followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement for cross-sectional studies in reporting our findings.³⁹

Study Design

This study was an anonymous, cross-sectional online survey administered to authors who have published in cardiology medical journals indexed on OVID MEDLINE.⁴⁰

Sampling Framework

A sample of corresponding authors from all articles published between December 15th, 2018 and August 1st, 2023 was selected from a sample of cardiology journals found at <https://journal-reports.nlm.nih.gov/broad-subjects/>.⁴¹ Authors with published articles of any type were included in this study. The search strategy was based on National Library of Medicine (NLM) IDs extracted from selected journals and was run on OVID MEDLINE. The resulting list of approximately 150,000 PubMed Identifiers (PMIDs) was exported as a .csv file and input into an R script (built based on the easyPubMed package).⁴² This retrieved the authors' names, affiliation institutions, and email addresses that were used in this study. A power analysis was not included because this is a convenience sample with descriptive work that lacks any inferential testing. The search strategy can be found at <https://osf.io/59wxg>.

Participant Recruitment

Prospective participants identified from the sampling framework were the only individuals contacted to partake in this study and complete the closed survey. To be eligible, participants needed to be able to read and write in English. Emails based on a recruitment script that included an explanation of the study and its goals, along with a link to the survey, were sent to prospective participants using the Survey Monkey website.⁴³ When the survey link was clicked, participants could review the informed consent form, which included the purpose of the study, the length of time to complete the survey, the principal investigator's name, and data storage information. Participants were then asked to respond to a yes/no question asking for consent to partake in the study. If participants responded 'yes' (i.e., they gave consent), they were given access to the first page of the online survey. Except for this consent question, participants were able to skip any questions they did not wish to respond to. All responses were collected anonymously. The email list was expected to contain duplicates (i.e., authors corresponding to multiple manuscripts with the sample set), which were removed before sending out the survey. Non-functioning or invalid email addresses (i.e., emails that bounce back following dispatch) were also anticipated to be present following dispatch. The survey was open between November 1st, 2023, and December 26th, 2023. Participants were sent reminder emails in the first, second, and third weeks following the original invitation email. The survey was voluntary, and respondents were not provided with financial compensation for participation.

Survey Design

The Survey Monkey platform was used to create and distribute the survey.⁴³ Following a screening question, participants were asked a series of demographic questions (7 questions),

followed by a section about their perceptions of CAIM (25 questions). Most of the survey questions used a multiple-choice and 5-point Likert scale (i.e., strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree) format. Some survey items asked respondents about their views on CAIM therapies *in general*, along with their opinions on five subcategories of CAIM therapies: 1) mind-body therapies (e.g., meditation, biofeedback, hypnosis, yoga, tai chi, imagery, creative outlets); 2) biologically based practices (e.g., vitamins and dietary supplements, botanicals, special foods and diets, phytotherapy); 3) manipulative and body-based practices (e.g., massage, chiropractic therapy, reflexology); 4) biofield therapies (e.g., reiki, therapeutic touch); and 5) whole medical systems (e.g., Ayurvedic medicine, traditional Chinese medicine, acupuncture, homeopathy, naturopathic medicine). A small minority of questions were open-ended. Depending on the context, some questions were also solely presented to participants who identified as researchers or clinicians. The first iteration of the survey was pilot tested by researchers not involved in this study. Feedback from the pilot-test was reviewed and incorporated into the survey prior to administration. The survey can be found at <https://osf.io/ef8hx>.

Data Management and Analysis

Quantitative data was used to generate basic descriptive statistics, including counts and percentages. For the narrative summary, participants that had ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ with a statement on the 5-point Likert scale were grouped together as supporting/agreeing with that statement and respondents that ‘disagreed’ or ‘strongly disagreed’ were grouped together as opposing/disagreeing with that statement. Qualitative data was analysed using a thematic content analysis.⁴⁴ Two research team members (JYN, SK) independently coded participant responses,

followed by iterative rounds of discussion (JYN, SK) to reach a final consensus on the codes and themes. The data was then categorically classified into distinct tables for reporting.

Results

Out of the 37,915 email invitations, 10,543 remained unopened and 4,872 bounced. A total of 309 respondents met the eligibility criteria and took part in the survey (0.82% response rate for all emails sent; 1.37% response rate for all emails opened). Of the sent invitations, the survey completion rate was 71%, and the average completion time was 8 minutes 11 seconds. All survey questions were optional, resulting in a varied response rate for each question. Anonymous raw survey responses can be found at <https://osf.io/9e4yt>.

Demographic Characteristics

Most participants self-identified as male (67.88%, n=205) and between 35 and 54 years old (53.31%, n=161). A total of 38.19% (n=118) of participants identified solely as researchers, 5.83% (n=18) identified solely as clinicians, and 55.99% (n=173) identified as *both* researchers and clinicians within the cardiology field. According to the World Health Organization World Regions classification,⁴⁵ respondents were predominantly located in Europe (46.15%, n=138) and the Americas (33.44%, n=100). In terms of professional roles, most respondents identified as ‘faculty members and/or principal investigators’ (54.97%, n=166), ‘clinicians’ (45.70%, n=138), or ‘scientists in academia’ (27.15%, n=82). Many participants were senior researchers or clinicians with over 10 years of experience post formal career education (64.45%, n=194). The primary research areas for most participants was clinical (83.27%, n=219) and epidemiological

research (21.67%, n=57). Most respondents had never conducted research in the field of CAIM (77.01%, n=201). Complete participant demographics are provided in **Table 1**.

CAIM Perceptions

Mind-body therapies (57.61%, n=159) and biologically based practices (47.46%, n=131) were considered to be the most promising interventions for the prevention, treatment, and/or management of cardiovascular diseases and conditions. When asked about the safety and effectiveness of CAIM therapies overall, most participants agreed on its safety (45.78%, n=114), but disagreed on its effectiveness (44.40%, n=111).

Views regarding the safety and efficacy of specific CAIM subcategories were dependent on the modality presented. A total of 72.07% (n=178) believed mind-body therapies were safe. In contrast, about or less than 40% of participants agreed with the safety of biologically based practices (33.74%, n=83), manipulative and body-based practices (36.74%, n=90), biofield therapies (40.75%, n=99), and whole medical systems (32.58%, n=79; **Figure 1**). Among all the CAIM modalities, mind-body therapies were most often viewed as effective (38.87%, n=96). In comparison, biologically based practices, biofield therapies, and whole medical systems garnered variable levels of support, with 9.87% to 23.77% of participants believing that such modalities are effective and 31.56% to 44.67% disagreeing with their effectiveness (**Figure 2**).

Participants were asked about the perceived benefits associated with CAIM. Several key advantages were acknowledged: ‘focus on prevention and lifestyle changes’ (60.42%, n=145), ‘holistic approach to health and wellness’ (58.33%, n=140), ‘expanded treatment options for

patients' (56.25%, n=135), 'empowerment of patients to take control of their health' (52.92%, n=127), and 'increased patient satisfaction and well-being' (50.42%, n=121; **Figure 3**). Participants were also asked about the perceived challenges they associate with CAIM. The majority of clinicians had concerns with the 'lack of scientific evidence for safety and efficacy' (92.65%, n=227), 'lack of standardization in product quality and dosing' (86.53%, n=212), 'limited regulation and oversight' (74.29%, n=182), 'difficulty in distinguishing legitimate practices from scams or fraudulent claims' (68.57%, n=168), and the 'limited integration with mainstream healthcare systems' (50.61%, n=124; **Figure 4**).

Clinical Experiences with CAIM

Participants reported that biologically based practices (75.58%, n=130) and mind-body therapies (54.65%, n=94) were the most sought out by patients through counselling or disclosed usage. Most participants (57.06%, n=97) reported that 0-10% of their patients disclose using and/or seek counselling for CAIM therapies. This was followed by 25.88% (n=44) indicating that 11-20% of patients do so. A substantial portion of participants acknowledged being asked 'occasionally' (58.84%, n=163) and 'often' (13.00%, n=36) about CAIM by individuals outside of research and/or clinical settings (e.g., family members, friends). Mind-body therapies (44.44%, n=76) and biologically based practices (29.24%, n=50) were reported as the areas of CAIM that the greatest proportion of participants had practiced or recommended to patients. A large portion (37.43%, n=64) also indicated that they have never used or recommended CAIM therapies.

The majority of respondents expressed discomfort in counselling (47.06%, n=72; **Figure 5**) and recommending (59.86%, n=91; **Figure 6**) CAIM therapies to patients in general. Comfort with

types of CAIM therapeutics varied by subcategory. Participants were the most uncomfortable with counselling (59.18%, n=87) and recommending (69.83%, n=102) biofield therapies to patients. Conversely, respondents were the least uncomfortable with counselling (42.00%, n=63) and recommending (36.91%, n=55) mind-body therapies to patients.

When participants were surveyed about whether CAIM therapies should be covered by insurance, the majority (42.00%, n=105) expressed disagreement. This sentiment was echoed across various CAIM subcategories, including biologically based practices (46.75%, n=115), manipulative and body-based practices (40.81%, n=100), biofield therapies (53.91%, n=131), and whole medical systems (46.72%, n=114). Interestingly, opinions regarding insurance coverage for mind-body therapies were more evenly distributed, with 30.89% (n=76) in support, 36.18% (n=89) as neutral, and 32.92% (n=81) being opposed. Similarly, with the exception of mind-body therapies, which had relatively high rates of supportive (34.42%, n=85) and neutral (36.44%, n=90) responses, the majority of participants disagreed with the integration of CAIM into mainstream medical practice, with responses ranging from 42.04% to 52.67% in disagreement depending on the CAIM subcategory (**Figure 7**).

Attitudes Towards CAIM Research

Most participants 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' that there is value in research being conducted on CAIM therapies (79.20%, n=198; **Figure 8**). Specifically, high levels of agreement were observed when asked about the value in conducting further research on mind-body therapies (78.95%, n=195), biologically based practices (75.92%, n=186), manipulative and body-based practices (58.61%, n=143), and whole medical systems (59.42%, n=145). The only CAIM

modality with varied opinions on conducting research was biofield therapies, with similar levels of support (36.22%, n=88), neutrality (33.33%, n=81), and disagreement (30.45%, n=74) being observed. Similarly, most participants agreed that more research funding should be allocated to study CAIM therapies in general (52.42%, n=130). In terms of specific CAIM modalities, mind-body therapies (53.47%, n=131), biologically based practices (75.92%, n=186), manipulative and body-based practices (42.04%, n=103), and whole medical systems (45.09%, n=110) had general agreement that more research funds should be allocated to study the respective CAIM categories. The modality with the smallest proportion of participants supporting increased research funds was biofield therapies (23.87%, n=58).

CAIM Education

Most respondents report never receiving formal education (80.70%, n=138; **Figure 9**) or supplementary education (67.06%, n=114; **Figure 10**) on the use of CAIM therapies in general. However, a portion had received supplementary education on mind-body therapies (18.24%, n=31) and biologically based practices (17.06%, n=29). Many participants support clinicians receiving more formal (53.20%, n=133) and supplementary education (62.10%, n=154) on CAIM therapies. In particular, similar rates of support for additional formal and supplementary education, respectively, were observed across most CAIM subcategories, including mind-body therapies (51.02%, n=126; 57.72%, n=142), biologically based practices (55.11%, n=135; 54.06%, n=133), manipulative and body-based therapies (37.04%, n=90; 41.56%, n=101), and whole medical systems (33.2%, n=81; 35.39%, n=86). Biofield therapies was the sole exception, with limited participants supporting the necessity for additional formal (22.31%, n=54) and supplementary (24.69%, n=60) training. When asked where participants would seek out

information if they wanted to learn more about CAIM, most respondents indicated they would refer to ‘academic literature’ (90.22%, n=249), ‘conference presentations or workshops’ (35.14%, n=97), and ‘health information pages on the internet’ (30.07%, n=83).

Thematic Analysis

When participants were asked to share their remaining perceptions of CAIM, six major themes (twenty parent codes) were created from 55 open-ended survey responses. The first theme, “Need for more rigorous research and resources to inform decision making about CAIM,” encompasses opinions that advocate for more rigorous research, more education, and the need to standardize CAIM therapies. Comments emphasizing the importance of scientific methods in CAIM research were also placed under this theme. The second theme, “CAIM products can be harmful due to misuse/misinformation,” includes responses that note concerns with CAIM therapies being used as a replacement for traditional treatment instead of in a complementary fashion. Additionally, comments expressing concern over exploitative marketing techniques were also coded under this theme. The third theme, “Concern with CAIM categories,” encompasses responses that did not agree with the subcategorization of CAIM therapies. Simultaneously, within the same theme, respondents also expressed concerns with treating CAIM as a homogenous entity. For example, one participant was conflicted regarding the *overall* efficacy of CAIM because they believed in the effectiveness of some CAIM interventions (i.e., relaxation therapy) but not others (i.e., chiropractic manipulations). The next theme, “CAIM is appealing to patients,” includes comments that acknowledge the cultural significance of CAIM and how patients practice CAIM more than what is disclosed to healthcare providers. The “Polar or personal opinions/experiences (pro vs. anti)” theme encompassed comments that were either

in support or against CAIM therapies without justification behind their standpoint. Comments that were personal in nature and/or anecdotal were also categorized under this theme. The last theme, “CAIM in the clinical and/or academic field of cardiology,” includes comments that spoke specifically about CAIM in cardiology. Comments under this theme mention the potential of CAIM, the need for more research on CAIM in relation to cardiology, and how certain therapies can be harmful to cardiac conditions (e.g., adverse drug reactions). Coding and thematic analysis data are available at: <https://osf.io/nctjd>.

Discussion

The objective of this study was to investigate the perceptions and awareness of CAIM practices among cardiology researchers and clinicians. While existing literature predominantly examines patients’ perceptions and attitudes towards CAIM,^{46–49} our study focuses on the perspectives of professionals involved in clinical or academic cardiology specifically. Findings demonstrate that, while researchers and clinicians in the field of cardiology view CAIM therapies as generally safe and potentially beneficial, there is a significant need for more research and educational training on certain CAIM therapies. Given that modifiable lifestyle factors play a significant role in cardiac health, understanding the perceptions of CAIM held by cardiology professionals is imperative.^{50,51}

Comparative Literature

A large proportion of cardiology researchers and clinicians reported feeling skeptical about the efficacy of CAIM therapies. Survey responses suggest that this may be due to CAIM being perceived as lacking high-quality, rigorous evidence. This sentiment has been reflected in similar studies investigating the perspectives of researchers and clinicians within neurology, psychiatry,

and oncology.⁵²⁻⁵⁴ Perceptions of CAIM held by healthcare professionals have been shown to depend on several different factors, including personal experiences, the recommendations of respected peers and case reports about treatments and conditions in CAIM journals.⁵⁵⁻⁵⁷ It was also found that, while some medical schools do provide education on CAIM, they approach the topic with overt bias (both overly positive or overly negative), which is reported to impact the perspective of medical students and thus their subsequent willingness to refer patients to CAIM therapies.⁵⁸

Furthermore, while cardiology researchers and clinicians present a lack of comfort with counseling or recommending CAIM, many report being asked about such therapies by individuals outside of research/clinical settings (e.g., family and friends). While similar trends have been observed within the literature,⁵²⁻⁵⁴ such viewpoints are particularly relevant for cardiology due to the strong influence that lifestyle factors play in the management of cardiovascular disease.^{50,51} Within integrative cardiology, a subfield of cardiology that focuses on using evidence-based healing modalities that focus on health and prevention, “*lifestyle modifications, including nutrition and physical activity, are pillars that are complemented by mind-body interventions, acupuncture, and [the] appropriate use of nutraceuticals*”.⁵⁹ The significance of lifestyle factors, along with results from the present analysis and the association of cardiovascular disease with the use of CAIM therapies,^{18,29,60,61} emphasize the importance of understanding cardiology-related perceptions of CAIM.

Participants reported that, of the five CAIM subcategories, mind-body therapies and biologically based practices were viewed as the most promising and were the most sought-out by patients.

This is similar to findings in other studies,⁵²⁻⁵⁴ likely because these therapies are accessible and generally safe to experiment with.⁶²⁻⁶⁴ Further, mind-body therapies (e.g., yoga, relaxation, variants of cognitive behavioral therapy) are widely viewed as low-cost methods to improve blood pressure, mental health, and overall fitness.⁶⁵⁻⁶⁸ Several studies note that such therapies help with systemic inflammation, stress, the cardiac autonomic nervous system, and cardiovascular risk factors.⁶⁸

While biologically-based factors have been noted to have potential and to be popular amongst patients,^{29,60} respondents disagreed on its efficacy. The thematic analysis revealed that participants were hesitant about CAIM due to the potential for treatments to adversely impact and interfere with cardiovascular medications and conditions. For example, bitter orange and ginkgo biloba extracts or supplements, common ingredients in CAIM medications, have been linked to increased heart rate.⁶⁹⁻⁷¹ The risk for biologically-based factors, such as herbal supplements, to interfere with cardiovascular medication may consequently be why many cardiology researchers and clinicians have expressed hesitation about its efficacy.

Biofield therapies were viewed the least favorably by cardiology researchers and clinicians. Specifically, participants provided the least support towards enhancing formal and supplementary education and allocating research funding towards this CAIM subcategory. Further, respondents were not comfortable with counselling and recommending these practices to patients or integrating biofield therapies into mainstream medical practices. While being shown to aid with cardiac conditions,⁷²⁻⁷⁴ prior literature has suggested that methodological shortcomings and a lack of research transparency associated with biofield therapy studies have

limited confidence in these interventions.^{75,76} Respondents within the present analysis identified a ‘lack of scientific evidence for safety and efficacy’ as the greatest challenge associated with CAIM. Consequently, the lack of rigor and transparency associated with biofield therapy research, as suggested within prior literature,^{75,76} may be why respondents presented with the most discomfort towards such interventions.

Strengths and Limitations

One strength of this study is the utilization of an online cross-sectional survey, which resulted in a large sample comprised of individuals with varied perspectives regarding CAIM. This method was also inexpensive and efficient. This survey acquired responses from clinicians and researchers with a range of professional roles and experiences, which improved its generalizability to the cardiology field in general.

This study is also subject to several limitations. First, the survey was exclusively administered in English, and a predominant proportion of respondents were from Europe and the Americas, potentially constraining the generalizability of the findings.⁷⁷ This limitation is relevant because personal characteristics associated with lived experiences (e.g., age, gender, prior exposure, cultural background, and education) and the geographic location of individuals have been seen to influence the use and perceptions of CAIM therapies within prior literature.^{78,79} Furthermore, the categorization of CAIM into five subcategories within the survey may have oversimplified the nuanced efficacy, perceptions, and safety of each modality, leading participants to generalize their opinions on these therapies. This issue was evident in the thematic analysis, where many participants expressed concerns about the broad categorization of CAIM, highlighting potential

flaws in accurately assessing their perceptions. Lastly, bias may have been introduced due to the nature of the study. For instance, responses within the present analysis could be susceptible to response bias, as differences between responders and non-responders to the online survey could impact the representativeness of the sample.⁸⁰ Alternatively, a difference in response between survey respondents and non-responders, otherwise known as non-response bias, may have also been introduced because researchers and clinicians with an interest in CAIM are more likely to partake in the survey.⁸⁰ Participants may also have been subject to recall bias, where responses are influenced by the varying accuracy and knowledge with which individuals remember their own experiences due to the self-reporting nature of the survey.⁸⁰

Conclusion

This study investigated the practice and perceptions of clinicians and researchers within the field of cardiology. The present analysis highlights the necessity for further research on CAIM and emphasizes the importance of providing both formal and informal education and training for cardiology professionals in this field. Among the CAIM subcategories, mind-body therapies and biologically based practices were the most favored, and biofield therapies were the least favored by cardiology clinicians and researchers. With the importance of prevention and lifestyle modifications for cardiac health, along with the increasing number of patients turning to CAIM, it is essential for cardiology professionals to have access to research and education tailored to meet their patients' needs. This study serves as a foundation for such endeavors.

Acknowledgements

There are no acknowledgements for this study.

Sources of Funding

This study received no funding.

Declarations

None.

References

1. Liu Y, Chen S, Zühlke L, Black GC, Choy M, Li N, Keavney BD. Global birth prevalence of congenital heart defects 1970–2017: updated systematic review and meta-analysis of 260 studies. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* 2019;48:455–463.
2. Tschöpe C, Ammirati E, Bozkurt B, Caforio ALP, Cooper LT, Felix SB, Hare JM, Heidecker B, Heymans S, Hübner N, et al. Myocarditis and inflammatory cardiomyopathy: current evidence and future directions. *Nat. Rev. Cardiol.* 2021;18:169–193.
3. Olvera Lopez E, Ballard BD, Jan A. Cardiovascular Disease [Internet]. In: StatPearls. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2024 [cited 2024 Apr 27]. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK535419/>
4. Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) [Internet]. WHO. [cited 2024 Apr 27]; Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cardiovascular-diseases-\(cvds\)](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cardiovascular-diseases-(cvds))
5. Cardiovascular diseases [Internet]. WHO. [cited 2024 Apr 27]; Available from: <https://www.who.int/health-topics/cardiovascular-diseases>
6. Mahipala P, Dorji G, Tisocki K, Rani M. A critical review of addressing cardiovascular and other non-communicable diseases through a primary health care approach in the South-East Asia Region. *Cardiovasc. Diagn. Ther.* 2019;9:150–157.
7. Wu W, He J, Shao X. Incidence and mortality trend of congenital heart disease at the global, regional, and national level, 1990–2017. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2020;99:e20593.
8. Bouma BJ, Mulder BJM. Changing Landscape of Congenital Heart Disease. *Circ. Res.* 2017;120:908–922.
9. Chandarana M, Curtis A, Hoskins C. The use of nanotechnology in cardiovascular disease. *Appl. Nanosci.* 2018;8:1607–1619.
10. Sebastian SA, Co EL, Mahtani A, Padda I, Anam M, Mathew SS, Shahzadi A, Niazi M, Pawar S, Johal G. Heart Failure: Recent Advances and Breakthroughs. *Dis. Mon.* 2024;70:101634.
11. Epstein E, Patel N, Maysent K, Taub PR. Cardiac Rehab in the COVID Era and Beyond: mHealth and Other Novel Opportunities. *Curr. Cardiol. Rep.* 2021;23:42.
12. Antoniou V, Davos CH, Kapreli E, Batalik L, Panagiotakos DB, Pepera G. Effectiveness of Home-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation, Using Wearable Sensors, as a Multicomponent, Cutting-Edge Intervention: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J. Clin. Med.* 2022;11:3772.
13. Bouchard T, Subichin M, Firstenberg M. Fifty years of cardiac surgery: Innovation, evolution, and revolution in cardiovascular therapies. *Int. J. Acad. Med.* 2019;5:156.

14. Golder HJ, Papalois V. Enhanced Recovery after Surgery: History, Key Advancements and Developments in Transplant Surgery. *J. Clin. Med.* 2021;10:1634.
15. Kumar A, Siddharth V, Singh SI, Narang R. Cost analysis of treating cardiovascular diseases in a super-specialty hospital. *PLOS ONE.* 2022;17:e0262190.
16. Slavin SD, Khera R, Zafar SY, Nasir K, Warraich HJ. Financial burden, distress, and toxicity in cardiovascular disease. *Am. Heart J.* 2021;238:75–84.
17. Khera R, Valero-Elizondo J, Nasir K. Financial Toxicity in Atherosclerotic Cardiovascular Disease in the United States: Current State and Future Directions. *J. Am. Heart Assoc.* 2020;9:e017793.
18. Than MC, A. A, K. N, A. A, M.Y. H. Knowledge, use of complementary alternative medicine and health-related quality of life among cardiovascular disease patients. *Food Res.* 2019;3:604–616.
19. Nasri H. A mini-review to the common adverse-effects of statins. *J. Ren. Endocrinol.* 2022;8:e25071.
20. Iqbal AM, Lopez RA, Hai O. Antiplatelet Medications [Internet]. In: StatPearls. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2024 [cited 2024 Apr 27]. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK537062/>
21. Herman LL, Padala SA, Ahmed I, Bashir K. Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibitors (ACEI) [Internet]. In: StatPearls. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2024 [cited 2024 Apr 27]. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK431051/>
22. Mori M, Khera R. Pumping the Breaks on Health Care Costs of Cardiac Surgery by Focusing on Postacute Care Spending. *Circ. Cardiovasc. Qual. Outcomes.* 2020;13:e007253.
23. Wu T, Wong SKH, Law BTT, Grieve E, Wu O, Tong DKH, Leung DKW, Ng EKW, Lam CLK, Wong CKH. Bariatric surgery is expensive but improves co-morbidity: 5-year assessment of patients with obesity and type 2 diabetes. *Br. J. Surg.* 2021;108:554–565.
24. Zörgő S, Peters G-JY, Mkhitarian S. Attitudes Underlying Reliance on Complementary and Alternative Medicine. *Integr. Cancer Ther.* 2020;19:153473542091047.
25. Hoosen M, Roman NV, Mthembu TG. The role of spirituality and spiritual care in complementary and alternative medicine: A scoping review. *Bangladesh J. Med. Sci.* 2021;20:714–724.
26. Ng JY, Boon HS, Thompson AK, Whitehead CR. Making sense of “alternative”, “complementary”, “unconventional” and “integrative” medicine: exploring the terms and meanings through a textual analysis. *BMC Complement. Altern. Med.* 2016;16:134.
27. Complementary, Alternative, or Integrative Health: What’s In a Name? [Internet]. Natl. Cent. Complement. Integr. Health NCCIH. [cited 2024 Apr 27]; Available from:

<https://www.nccih.nih.gov/health/complementary-alternative-or-integrative-health-whats-in-a-name>

28. Lee EL, Richards N, Harrison J, Barnes J. Prevalence of Use of Traditional, Complementary and Alternative Medicine by the General Population: A Systematic Review of National Studies Published from 2010 to 2019. *Drug Saf.* 2022;45:713–735.
29. Wood MJ, Stewart RL, Merry H, Johnstone DE, Cox JL. Use of complementary and alternative medical therapies in patients with cardiovascular disease. *Am. Heart J.* 2003;145:806–812.
30. Adams D, Whidden A, Honkanen M, Dagenais S, Clifford T, Baydala L, King WJ, Vohra S. Complementary and alternative medicine: a survey of its use in pediatric cardiology. *CMAJ Open.* 2014;2:E217–E224.
31. Fischer FH, Lewith G, Witt CM, Linde K, Von Ammon K, Cardini F, Falkenberg T, Fønnebø V, Johannessen H, Reiter B, et al. High prevalence but limited evidence in complementary and alternative medicine: guidelines for future research. *BMC Complement. Altern. Med.* 2014;14:46.
32. Veziari Y, Leach MJ, Kumar S. Barriers to the conduct and application of research in complementary and alternative medicine: a systematic review. *BMC Complement. Altern. Med.* 2017;17:166.
33. Veziari Y, Kumar S, Leach M. Addressing barriers to the conduct and application of research in complementary and alternative medicine: a scoping review. *BMC Complement. Med. Ther.* 2021;21:201.
34. Sugito R, Son D. Obstacles to the use of complementary and alternative medicine by primary care physicians: Preliminary study. *Tradit. Kampo Med.* 2019;6:173–177.
35. Ventola CL. Current Issues Regarding Complementary and Alternative Medicine (CAM) in the United States. *Pharm. Ther.* 2010;35:461–468.
36. Clarke MA, Moore JL, Steege LM, Koopman RJ, Belden JL, Canfield SM, Meadows SE, Elliott SG, Kim MS. Health information needs, sources, and barriers of primary care patients to achieve patient-centered care: A literature review. *Health Informatics J.* 2016;22:992–1016.
37. Spinks J, Johnston D, Hollingsworth B. Complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) use and quality of life in people with type 2 diabetes and/or cardiovascular disease. *Complement. Ther. Med.* 2014;22:107–115.
38. Open Science Framework (OSF) [Internet]. Available from: <https://osf.io/>
39. Elm E von, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *The Lancet.* 2007;370:1453–1457.

40. MEDLINE [Internet]. Natl. Libr. Med. [cited 2024 Apr 27]; Available from: https://www.nlm.nih.gov/medline/medline_home.html
41. Cardiology[st] Search Results [Internet]. Natl. Libr. Med. [cited 2024 Apr 27]; Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog?term=Cardiology%5Bst%5D>
42. Fantini D. easyPubMed Package; CRAN [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2024 Apr 27]; Available from: <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/easyPubMed/index.html>
43. SurveyMonkey [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/>
44. Joffe, Helene and Yardley, Lucy (2003) Content and thematic analysis. In, Marks, David F. and Yardley, Lucy (eds.) *Research Methods for Clinical and Health Psychology*. SAGE Publications, pp. 56-68.
45. Countries [Internet]. World Health Organ. [cited 2024 Apr 29]; Available from: <https://www.who.int/countries>
46. Bruce C, Achan V, Rathore S. Yoga-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation: Current Perspectives from Randomized Controlled Trials in Coronary Artery Disease. *Vasc. Health Risk Manag.* 2021;17:779–789.
47. Sharifi MH, Mohammadi S, Pahlavani N, Ghaffarian-Bahraman A, Darabi S, Nikoo MH, Zohalinezhad ME. Utilization of Complementary and Alternative Medicine among Patients with Cardiovascular Disease in Iran: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Tradit. Integr. Med.* 2024;13–23.
48. Yang X, Wang T, Jiang Y, Ren F, Jiang H. Patients' Expectancies to Acupuncture: A Systematic Review. *J. Integr. Complement. Med.* 2022;28:202–217.
49. Singh A, Dixit S. A study on the motivation of Indian patients to consult complementary and alternative medicine practitioners to treat coronary artery disease. *Int. J. Health Plann. Manage.* 2021;36:423–441.
50. Ghodeswar GK, Dube A, Khobragade D. Impact of Lifestyle Modifications on Cardiovascular Health: A Narrative Review. *Cureus* [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Apr 27]; Available from: <https://www.cureus.com/articles/172900-impact-of-lifestyle-modifications-on-cardiovascular-health-a-narrative-review>
51. Franklin BA, Rusia A, Haskin-Popp C, Tawney A. Chronic Stress, Exercise and Cardiovascular Disease: Placing the Benefits and Risks of Physical Activity into Perspective. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public. Health.* 2021;18:9922.
52. Ng JY, Kochhar J, Cramer H. Oncology Researchers' and Clinicians' Perceptions of Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Medicine: An International, Cross-Sectional Survey [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 Apr 27]; Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2024.03.03.24303667>

53. Ng JY, Kochhar J, Cramer H. An International, Cross-Sectional Survey of Psychiatry Researchers and Clinicians: Perceptions of Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Medicine. *Front. Psychiatry*. 2024;15.
54. Ng JY, Li SY, Cramer H. Perceptions and attitudes regarding complementary, alternative, and integrative medicine among published neurology authors: a large-scale, international cross-sectional survey. *BMC Neurol*. 2024;24:215.
55. Hewson MG, Copeland HL, Mascha E, Arrigain S, Topol E, Fox JEB. Integrative medicine: implementation and evaluation of a professional development program using experiential learning and conceptual change teaching approaches. *Patient Educ. Couns*. 2006;62:5–12.
56. Wahner-Roedler DL, Lee MC, Chon TY, Cha SS, Loehrer LL, Bauer BA. Physicians' attitudes toward complementary and alternative medicine and their knowledge of specific therapies: 8-Year follow-up at an academic medical center. *Complement. Ther. Clin. Pract*. 2014;20:54–60.
57. Astin JA, Sierpina VS, Forys K, Clarridge B. Integration of the Biopsychosocial Model: Perspectives of Medical Students and Residents: *Acad. Med*. 2008;83:20–27.
58. Abbott RB, Hui K-K, Hays RD, Mandel J, Goldstein M, Winegarden B, Glaser D, Brunton L. Medical Student Attitudes toward Complementary, Alternative and Integrative Medicine. *Evid.-Based Complement. Altern. Med. ECAM*. 2011;2011:985243.
59. Malik S, Dineen EH. Integrative Approaches for Cardiovascular Disease Prevention [Internet]. In: *ASPC Manual of Preventive Cardiology*. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2021 [cited 2024 Apr 27]. p. 705–732. Available from: https://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-030-56279-3_28
60. Young LA, Faurot KR, Gaylord SA. Use of and Communication about Dietary Supplements Among Hospitalized Patients. *J. Gen. Intern. Med*. 2009;24:366–369.
61. Artz MB, Harnack LJ, Duval SJ, Armstrong C, Arnett DK, Luepker RV. Use of Nonprescription Medications for Perceived Cardiovascular Health. *Am. J. Prev. Med*. 2006;30:78–81.
62. Bhattacharyya KK, Andel R, Small BJ. Effects of yoga-related mind-body therapies on cognitive function in older adults: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *Arch. Gerontol. Geriatr*. 2021;93:104319.
63. Grant SJ, Bin YS, Kiat H, Chang DH-T. The use of complementary and alternative medicine by people with cardiovascular disease: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*. 2012;12:299.
64. Hamishehkar H, Ranjdoost F, Asgharian P, Mahmoodpoor A, Sanaie S. Vitamins, Are They Safe? *Adv. Pharm. Bull*. 2016;6:467–477.

65. Sun L, Zhuang L-P, Li X-Z, Zheng J, Wu W-F. Tai Chi can prevent cardiovascular disease and improve cardiopulmonary function of adults with obesity aged 50 years and older. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2019;98:e17509.
66. Guddeti RR, Dang G, Williams MA, Alla VM. Role of Yoga in Cardiac Disease and Rehabilitation. *J. Cardiopulm. Rehabil. Prev.* 2019;39:146–152.
67. Pandey A, Pandey A, Pandey AS, Bonsignore A, Auclair A, Poirier P. Impact of Yoga on Global Cardiovascular Risk as an Add-On to a Regular Exercise Regimen in Patients With Hypertension. *Can. J. Cardiol.* 2023;39:57–62.
68. Augsborg JB, Dar MI, Wood K, Rasmussen TB, Risom SS. A systematic literature review of the effect of mind-body interventions on mental health among patients with atrial fibrillation. *Ment. Health Prev.* 2022;28:200245.
69. Gange CA, Madias C, Felix-Getzik EM, Weintraub AR, Estes NAM. Variant Angina Associated With Bitter Orange in a Dietary Supplement. *Mayo Clin. Proc.* 2006;81:545–548.
70. Kuller LH, Ives DG, Fitzpatrick AL, Carlson MC, Mercado C, Lopez OL, Burke GL, Furberg CD, DeKosky ST. Does *Ginkgo biloba* Reduce the Risk of Cardiovascular Events? *Circ. Cardiovasc. Qual. Outcomes.* 2010;3:41–47.
71. Chow SL, Bozkurt B, Baker WL, Bleske BE, Breathett K, Fonarow GC, Greenberg B, Khazanie P, Leclerc J, Morris AA, et al. Complementary and Alternative Medicines in the Management of Heart Failure: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation* [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Apr 27];147. Available from: <https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/CIR.0000000000001110>
72. Gomes ET, Püschel VA de A. Effectiveness of Reiki therapy for preoperative anxiety in cardiac surgery: a randomized clinical trial. *Acta Paul. Enferm.* 2024;37:eAPE00082.
73. Bektas Akpinar N, Ozcan Yüce U, Cansız G, Yurtsever D, Özkanat C, Unal N, Sabanoglu C, Altınbas Akkas Ö, Yurtsever S. Is Reiki effective in reducing heart rhythm, cortisol levels, and anxiety and improving biochemical parameters in individuals with cardiac disease? Randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Eur. J. Cardiovasc. Nurs.* 2024;zvae051.
74. Batvani M, Yousefi H, Valiani M, Shahabi J, Mardanparvar H. The Effect of Acupressure on Physiological Parameters of Myocardial Infarction Patients: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Iran. J. Nurs. Midwifery Res.* 2018;23:143.
75. Jain S, Hammerschlag R, Mills P, Cohen L, Krieger R, Vieten C, Lutgendorf S. Clinical Studies of Biofield Therapies: Summary, Methodological Challenges, and Recommendations. *Glob. Adv. Health Med.* 2015;4:58–66.
76. Hammerschlag R, Sprengel ML, Baldwin AL. Biofield therapies: Guidelines for reporting clinical trials. *Complement. Ther. Med.* 2024;82:103011.

77. Degtiar I, Rose S. A Review of Generalizability and Transportability. *Annu. Rev. Stat. Its Appl.* 2023;10:501–524.
78. Tangkiatkumjai M, Boardman H, Walker D-M. Potential factors that influence usage of complementary and alternative medicine worldwide: a systematic review. *BMC Complement. Med. Ther.* 2020;20:363.
79. Fjær EL, Landet ER, McNamara CL, Eikemo TA. The use of complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) in Europe. *BMC Complement. Med. Ther.* 2020;20:108.
80. Wang X, Cheng Z. Cross-Sectional Studies: Strengths, Weaknesses, and Recommendations. *Chest.* 2020;158:S65–S71.

Table

Table 1: Characteristics of Survey Participants.

Demographic Factors	Participant Characteristics	n (%)
Gender (n=302)	Female	94 (31.13%)
	Male	205 (67.88%)
	Intersex	0 (0.00%)
	Prefer not to say	2 (0.66%)
	Prefer to self-describe	1 (0.33%)
Age (n=302)	Under 18	0 (0.00%)
	18-24	1 (0.33%)
	25-34	39 (12.91%)
	35-44	78 (25.83%)
	45-54	83 (27.48%)
	55-64	59 (19.54%)
	65 or older	40 (13.25%)
Visible Minority Status (n=302)	Prefer not to say	2 (0.66%)
	Yes	37 (12.25%)
	No	250 (82.78%)
World Region (n=299)	Prefer not to say	15 (4.97%)
	Africa	6 (2.01%)
	America	100 (33.44%)
	Eastern Mediterranean	11 (3.68%)
	Europe	138 (46.15%)
	South-East Asia	24 (8.03%)
	Western Pacific	16 (5.35%)
Current Position (n=302)	Prefer not to say	4 (1.34%)
	Clinician Student	6 (1.99%)
	Clinician	138 (45.70%)
	Graduate student	10 (3.31%)
	Postdoctoral fellow	12 (3.97%)
	Faculty member/Principal Investigator	166 (54.97%)
	Research support staff	11 (3.64%)
	Scientist in academia	82 (27.15%)
	Scientist in industry	2 (0.66%)
	Scientist in third sector	4 (1.32%)
	Government scientist	4 (1.32%)
Other (please specify)	9 (2.98%)	

Career stage (n=301)	Graduate or clinician student	10 (3.32%)
	Early career (<5 yrs post formal education)	40 (13.29%)
	Mid-career (5-10 yrs post formal education)	57 (18.94%)
	Senior (>10 yrs post formal education)	194 (64.45%)
Primary research area (n=263)	Clinical research	219 (83.27%)
	Preclinical research – in vivo	47 (17.87%)
	Preclinical research – in vitro	33 (12.55%)
	Health systems research	23 (8.75%)
	Health services research	31 (11.79%)
	Methods research	20 (7.60%)
	Epidemiological research	57 (21.67%)
Other (please specify)	7 (2.66%)	
Area of CAIM Research Experience (n=261)	Mind-body therapies	13 (4.98%)
	Biologically based practices	42 (16.09%)
	Manipulative and body-based practices	5 (1.92%)
	Biofield therapies	2 (0.77%)
	Whole medical systems	11 (4.21%)
	I have never conducted any CAIM research	201 (77.01%)
Other (please specify)	3 (1.15%)	

Note. CAIM indicates Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Medicine.

Figures




Figure 1: Participants’ Agreement Expressed Towards the Safety of Each Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Medicine (CAIM) Category




Figure 2: Participants’ Agreement Expressed Towards the Efficacy of Each Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Medicine (CAIM) Category




Figure 3: Benefits Participants Associated with Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Medicine (CAIM)




Figure 4: Challenges Participants Associated with Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Medicine (CAIM)




Figure 5: Clinicians’ Agreement Expressed Towards Feeling Comfortable Counselling Patients on Each Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Medicine (CAIM) Category




Figure 6: Clinicians’ Agreement Expressed Towards Feeling Comfortable Recommending Each Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Medicine (CAIM) Category to Patients




Figure 7: Participants’ Agreement Expressed Towards the Integration of Each Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Medicine (CAIM) Category into Mainstream Medical Practices




Figure 8: Participants’ Agreement Expressed Towards the Value of Conducting Research on Each Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Medicine (CAIM) Category




Figure 9: Participants’ Agreement Expressed Towards Clinicians Receiving Formal Education on Each Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Medicine (CAIM) Category




Figure 10: Participants’ Agreement Expressed Towards Clinicians Receiving Supplementary Education on Each Complementary, Alternative, and Integrative Medicine (CAIM) Category