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Dear Editor:

Thank you very much for your valuable comments and for giving us the opportunity to revise this manuscript. Please find our responses to your comments below.

This revised manuscript was also edited by a native English speaker at American Journal Experts.

Kind regards,

Junpei Komagamine
Response to Section Editor (Dr. Torkel Falkenberg)

Comment: the authors need to justify their definition and inclusion of UWC Kampo medications in relation to authoritative sources such as the WHO Monographs in a convincing way. Their statement "Finally, the definitions of UWC Kampo medications applied here were based on expert opinions rather than evidence. Therefore, it is unclear whether UWC Kampo medications are associated with worse patient outcomes" should be problematized to a larger extent in the discussion as well as in the abstract before accepting the manuscript for publication.

Response: Thank you very much for your comments. To evaluate the appropriateness of Kampo medication use, we used the definitions of UWC Kampo medications based on the 2015 Japan Geriatrics Society guidelines on traditional Chinese medicine. All five definitions applied in this study were based on low-quality studies, such as a case reports and case series, because high-quality clinical data regarding the safety of herbal medicines are lacking. However, the three definitions of UWC Kampo medications regarding aconite, Glycyrrhizae radix, and ephedra compositions correspond to contraindications or precautions based on the WHO monographs and a past review (Front Pharmacol 2014;4:177). According to your suggestion, the limitations of the definitions of UWC Kampo medications are explained in the Discussion (Pages 17-18, lines 270-280) as well as in the abstract (Page 3, lines 45-46) in the revised manuscript. We apologize if we did not respond to your suggestion appropriately.

Response to Additional Technical Comments (Marta Gritti)

Comment: Please remove the manuscript with tracked changes from the file inventory. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Response: We have followed these suggestions.

Response to Reviewer 1 (Tetsuhiro Yoshino, M.D., Ph.D.)

Comment: Authors completely responded my points.

Response: Thank you very much for your help with improving the quality of the manuscript.
Response to Reviewer 3 (Mojtaba Heydari)

Response: Thank you very much for reviewing the manuscript.