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**Reviewer's report:**

This is much improved and thanks to the authors for their hard work.

Minor essential revision:
1. Please check through to ensure that the distinction is made between the quality of trials and what you are actually measuring which is the reported quality of trials. For instance, the first sentence of the conclusion in the abstract reads ‘the quality of current TCM RCS...’ I suggest ‘The quality of current TCM RCTs as judged by their publications...’

2. The last clause of the abstract conclusions should be omitted i.e.....so as to improve the image of TCM clinical research and ensure reliable results are published'. Image is not a high priority reason for improvement.

3. Methods: Quality assessment. Please add something along the lines of ‘Assessment was based on trial publication only. We did not contact trial authors for clarification’.

4. Results: heading ‘Assessment of randomization methods....’ Please add ‘Assessment of reported randomization methods...’

**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:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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