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Reviewer's report:

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:
- 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."
- "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

Results:
- "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)

FULL TEXT

Discussion: some redundancy again, e.g.
- 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"
- 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.
- p.15/16, last/first sentence: Delete redundant sentence on low applicability
domain in TM and TCM, as this is already explained before.
- 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: Intraclass
correlation (ICC)
- 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.
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