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Dear Reviewers,

RE: The quality of clinical practice guidelines in traditional medicine in Korean: appraisal using the AGREE II instrument

On the behalf of my co-author, I would like to thank you for arranging peer-review of our manuscript and for your invitation to submit a revised version. We appreciate the effort of the reviewers, and believe that their constructive suggestions have resulted in a stronger manuscript for the Implementation Science’ readers.

Reviewer #1:

Comment 1) Running title the word Korea to be changed to – Korean

Revised> We have revised it.

Comment 2) Abstract - results should be in third person

Revised> We have revised it.

Comment 3) Abstract - conclusion still needs attention

Revised> We have revised it.

Comment 4) Keywords should make reference to the fact these CPGs are from Korea

Revised> We have revised it.

Comment 5) Still unclear how many were excluded because they were not evidence based and the total number of guidelines searched should be on the flow chart

Revised> We have revised it on the flow chart.
Reviewer #2:

Minor Compulsory Revisions:

Most comments made were addressed. However, the abstract should be revised, as it seems it had not been adapted according to the revised manuscript. Also, throughout the text some misunderstandings persist (which are mostly due to sentence formation). I attached the pdf file with my comments, in case the points raised here are not clear.

ABSTRACT

Background:

Comment 1) change sentence to be less confusing: e.g. to "This study aimed to evaluate the quality of the current Clinical Practice Guidelines in traditional medicine in South Korea using the AGREE II instrument to further enhance the development and revision of CPGs."

Revised> We have revised it.

Comment 2) "identify their quality to further enhance the development and revision of CPGs": as in my last comments, I would specify what you mean by revision (aiming at revising the current CPGs due to their low quality?) -> if this is not applicable this should be deleted

Revised> We have deleted it.

Results:

Comment 3) "We first examined 17 CPGs for TM in Korean, and only eight CPGs were consistent with the original aim of the CPGs based on an underlying systematic review of the evidence." --> I would delete the last part from "based on", as I think this sentence throws too many things in one and is not clear to me (e.g. what the SR is be based on)

Revised> We have revised it.
Discussion: some redundancy again, e.g.

**Comment 4)** First paragraph, last sentence: I would leave "the overall quality of the CPGs was not strong" out and start the sentence with the main claims that that certain domains (rigour of development etc) were the ones that had lower scores. The overall quality is already mentioned two sentences beforehand: "Our results showed that CPGs for TM are of moderate quality"

*Revised* We have revised it.

**Comment 5)** p.16, second paragraph:

"Most domains showed a higher reliability. Thus, appraisers showed a strong correlation and higher values for most domains besides applicability"

--> change "higher" to "high", otherwise indicate higher to what. I would also - - rephrase the second sentence, as the appraiser scores show a strong correlation not the appraisers themselves.

*Revised* We have revised it.

**Comment 6)** p.15/16, last/first sentence: Delete redundant sentence on low applicability domain in TM and TCM, as this is already explained before.

*Revised* We have deleted it.

**Comment 7)** p.14 Consistency: state once the whole name of ICC values and list the ICC in brackets behind it, so that the reader knows what the ICC values are: Intra class correlation (ICC)

*Revised* We have already wrote it in the method section.

**Comment 8)** look out for sentences that are redundant and that could be expressed in a less complicated way (as some of the examples stated above) to have a fluent and congruent text.

*Revised* Thank you for your contribution.
Thank you for your valuable comments.