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**Reviewer's report:**

Good job on the review and thank you for responding to my many comments. I think that the new structure makes it much more clear and the progress towards this regulation development is easier for me to understand. The methods section looks good.

I have some minor feedback that I would still like to see addressed:

Abstract: Methods: typo - remove "to examine"; Results: typo - the establishment and of responsible (remove and); 6) typo - the introduction of (a) requirement (include a).

p. 6, line 3: this sentence is confusing

line 22: spell out MOH - you have not spelled it out in the text yet (only in the abstract)

line 32: This was some of my feedback on the last round - just mentioning targets 4 & 5 of the MDG doesn't tell me what those goals are, why it is important, or how it relates to this article. Please elaborate. I needed to Google the goals to understand the context while reading the article.

p. 7, line 38: revise sentence confusing.

p. 8, line 21: if MOH is spelled out earlier it can be deleted here.

p. 8, section D: this section was the easiest and most clear for me. I like the way it was presented.

p. 10, line 21: Why is Japan being mentioned here? Maybe provide some context.

Section G) Interesting! I wonder, what happens to all the current practitioners, will they be required to go through this licensing process?

p. 12, line 11: you just mention Cambodia here, but then refer directly to the situation in Laos (multiple regulatory bodies). If you want the comparison maybe mention what is happening in Cambodia. As is I feel like you could simply say, the existence of multiple regulatory bodies...
makes the system complex (mentioning that that is also happening in Cambodia doesn't add anything).
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