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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript was improved over the previous version. However, there are still important areas that the authors need to address or clarify:

* The new title still looks confusing to me. First of all, I understand this was a study that involved periodic surveys on a 3-yr interval. To call the study 'a three-year, periodic, cross-sectional survey' is misleading. In addition, the use of a time-series design was to highlight the change over time so to name the study 'Trust and use of Korean medicine in 2014' missed this comparison angle.

* Given this paper aimed to compare the 2014 and 2011 findings, the authors need to provide details of the two surveys so the reader can see the changes or differences over time. However, the discussion/report was still biased towards a description of the 2014 findings, with details of the 2011 study mentioned only in passing (e.g. there is no description of the 2011 participants in the Methods section).

* With the exception of Table 1, all tables reported only 2014 data (actually, the title of Table 2-6 did not mention from which study the data came from). This way of presentation failed to provide a relational view of the time series data.

* The added explanation of the way the (open-ended?) responses were categorized into three major strategies was problematic. It is unclear what was meant by 'merely extracted on a conceptual basis' (page 20; lines 374-6). Moreover, the admission that 'There was no defined
method’ gives the reader the impression that the analysis was arbitrary and did not follow any systematic (qualitative?) procedure.

* The way the term 'reliability' was used in the manuscript (e.g. 'reduction in KM reliability', 'reliability of KM and Western Medicine') is confusing as the discussion had nothing to do with the quality of measurement or data. Are 'reduction in trust in KM' and 'attitudes toward KM and Western Medicine' more appropriate description?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
No

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

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.
I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Needs some language corrections before being published
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