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Major compulsory revisions
1. The introduction requires further amendment to improve readability.
   Specifically:
   - paragraph 2 (starting “The purpose of …”), perhaps the first sentence should read “The purpose of assessing the quality of systematic review is to examine the confidence of research findings.”

   We rewrote as follows:
   The reason for assessing the quality of systematic review is to examine the confidence of research findings.

   Also, the last 2 sentences in paragraph 3 (“The purpose of systematic…healthcare providers.”) could be incorporated into this paragraph as they address similar issues.

   We incorporated similar sentences into one paragraph as follows:

   A systematic review is used to investigate the best available evidence of clinical safety
and effectiveness of healthcare interventions and is carried out using a systematic approach to minimize bias and random error described in research subjects and method [2]. In addition, systematic reviews or meta-analyses were performed to facilitate the development of clinical practice guidelines for professionals, and to plan and conduct new researches [3, 4]. Therefore, a well-designed systematic review with high quality should be performed and published to provide the best available evidence to healthcare providers.

- paragraph 3 (“Reviews have been published…was serious [8].” Needs amendment to improve readability.

We revised the sentence as follows:
There have been several reviews assessing the methodological quality of systematic reviews of pharmaceutical care [3], oral health care [6], dental healthcare [7], pediatric oncology [8], and traditional Chinese medicine interventions [9].

2. The discussion requires further amendment to improve readability.
Specifically:
- paragraph 2 (“In addition, the research…. intervention were substantially heterogeneous.”) could be removed -

We deleted the paragraph as your comments.

One of the limitations was “we did not investigate the factors influencing the quality of reviews”, but the relationship between year of publication and quality was considered in the methods/results (see Figure 2). Perhaps this needs rewording.

We restated as follows:
Second, there are several factors affecting the quality of reviews such as area of healthcare, language, and clinical expertise filed of reviewers, but we only examined the
relationship between year of publication and quality.

Minor Essential Revisions

3. Some language needs to be changed from singular to plural. Including the amending the aim in the abstract to “To assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews or meta-analyses of interventions published in nursing journals by Korean researchers” and the first sentence of inclusion criteria to “We included meta-analyses or systematic reviews of the treatment effects of nursing intervention published in English or Korean by Korean reviewers”. Also, AMSTAR is the abbreviation of assessment of multiple systematic reviews.

   We revised the words as your advice.

4. Minor typographical errors include:
   - Abstract: bold the results sub-heading
   - Introduction: remove the line break between “…South Korea.” And Evidence-based nursing…”

   We revised the errors as your advice.

5. Abstract and sentence 2 in “methodological quality” section on page 8: change “(item 11)” to “(out of 11)”

   We revised the sentence as your comment.

The newly added description is written in red letters in manuscript.

Thank you for your advice.

Yours sincerely,

Kyeong Uoon Kim (RN, MPH, PhD)