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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes
3. Are the data sound? Yes
4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation? Yes
5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes
7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes
8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
10. Is the writing acceptable? Just about, there are still a few typos and a little more editing would improve some of the sentence structure but otherwise fine

In general this is an improvement on the original submission. As stated before whilst this study is not novel it does provide a benchmark for current herbal medicine use in Hungary as such has value in setting a benchmark for further studies.
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