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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you for re-submitting this paper. Your responses to reviewers comments are appropriately detailed. The only aspect not adequately addressed is the selection of the three reviewers. This should be included in the discussion section as outlined by reviewer #3. The inter-observer reliability is excellent so I wonder at your caution that three reviewers be used. Maybe a sentence explaining why?

We have included the following sentence in the discussion section:

“We suggest users of CheckUp to assess the reporting of the updating process in updated CGs by at least three calibrate reviewers. We involved three reviewers for convenience to avoid ties. Further examinations of CheckUp are required to determine if the inter-observer agreement between two reviewers would be adequate. Clinical expertise regarding the clinical area of the CG is not required, however, methodological comprehension on the updating process of CGs is highly desirable. To facilitate understanding of the domain scores and overall scores, we have transformed the domain and overall scores to a 10-point scale score.”