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Reviewer's report:

This is a content analysis study to count lines in all texts of relevant clinical practice guidelines. The theme of this study is important, and the results will be returned to the clinical practice. I have several comments; as follows.

#1: l 76-77; Cancer Control Ac → Cancer Control Act

#2: l 81-83; "An investigation of ⋯ in clinical practice."

Please quote several papers which support this opinion.

#3: l 135-136;

"two investigators" / "the two medical investigators" ⋯ Are they the same or not?

#4: l 146, 150, 152, 158;

In the part of CPG of breast cancer, "chemotherapy" / "chemo therapy" / "drug therapy" were used. Please use the same word.

#5: l 177-182;

The dates in the manuscripts (l 177-182) are different from the dates in Table 3 (eg. ovarian ca; 1.7% or 2.1%, 10.5% or 5.1%, pro ca; 12.9% or 9.0%, ⋯)

#6: l 192-194;

I am afraid that I can't find the date that prove the description on l 192-194. Where in the manuscript, table of figure?

#7: l 207:
"Palliative care workshops" • • • I recommend to describe more concretely, for example, "PEACE project".

#8: 1 244-245; "In previous studies, • • •"

Are there any other studies in addition to the study by Mast KR [13]? If so, please quote?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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