

**Peer Review File**

**Article Information:** <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/apm-22-795>

**Reviewer Comments**

The Protocol for A Methodological Study is interesting. Nevertheless, there are a few grammatical errors. I have corrected all of the grammatical errors for you, and I have attached the file and highlighted it in red.

Besides, I have made some comments for you to revise to improve the manuscript. I am willing to review it again if these comments are considered to improve the manuscript.

Below are the specific comments

Line 1-2

Should be italicized. The correct one should be *Ginkgo biloba* L.

Check these articles

Boateng, I. D. (2022). A critical review of current technologies used to reduce ginkgotoxin, ginkgotoxin-5'-glucoside, ginkgolic acid, allergic glycoprotein, and cyanide in *Ginkgo biloba* L. seed. Food Chemistry. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2022.132408>

Reply: Many thanks for your kind suggestion. “*Ginkgo biloba*” is also acceptable. Please see the following papers, but we have changed the word as you suggested.

Gu KJ, Lin CF, Wu JJ, Zhao YP. GinkgoDB: an ecological genome database for the living fossil, *Ginkgo biloba*. Database (Oxford). 2022;2022:baac046.

Bao L, Sun B, Liu J, et al. Leaf-Associated Epiphytic Fungi of *Ginkgo biloba*, *Pinus bungeana* and *Sabina chinensis* Exhibit Delicate Seasonal Variations. J Fungi (Basel). 2022;8(6):631. Published 2022 Jun 14. doi:10.3390/jof8060631

Line 36-37

Specify it. What type of univariate or multivariate analysis was used?

Reply: Many thanks for your kind suggestion. The univariate or multivariate linear analysis was used; we have highlighted them with red color.

Line 47

*Ginkgo* should be ‘*Ginkgo biloba* extract’ since *ginkgo* is too broad.

Reply: Many thanks for your kind suggestion. *Ginkgo biloba* L. is the first word in our manuscript, we believe the authors can understand *ginkgo* means what.

Line 50.

List all the abbreviations in the manuscript for complete understanding.

Reply: Many thanks for your kind suggestion. We have listed all key abbreviations, but some are not necessary such as COVID-19.

Line 72-74

Give a 2 sentences of their important findings and their limitations. Those limitations are what you are trying to improve. That will be the novelty.

Reply: Many thanks for your kind suggestion. We have changed the statements to show the potential limitations.

Line 98-99

Specify the specific year because this statement is vague.

Reply: Many thanks for your kind suggestion. We have stated, see “the inception to June 2022”, and the establishment date for each database is not identical.

Line 198 to.....

Where are the main findings? I did not see it throughout that manuscript.

Reply: Many thanks for your kind suggestion. The present report is a protocol as we reported in the background, a protocol does not have the results.

I am comparing this to your previous article.

Lu C, Ke L, Li J, et al. Saffron (*Crocus sativus* L.) and health outcomes: a meta-research review of meta-analyses and an evidence mapping study. *Phytomedicine*. 2021; 91:153699.

So, where are the critical discussion of your findings?. Please add these sections to improve the manuscript.

“Search results and study characteristics”

“Evidence maps of quality assessment”

“Health outcomes reported in the meta-analyses.”

Reply: Many thanks for your kind suggestion. The present report is a protocol as we reported in the background, a protocol does not have the results. You list the paper is a full text so it has the final results. Moreover, in the following manuscript, only the methodological and reporting quality of selected meta-analyses will be focused as outlined in the present protocol.

These should be added in the discussion section. There should be a comprehensive discussion.

Reply: Many thanks for your kind suggestion. The present report is a protocol as we reported in the background, a protocol does not have the results. Therefore, we just made a general discussion in the manuscript.