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Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for giving opportunity to revise our manuscript. We have revised according to the comments given by reviewer. The following are the point-by-point response of the comments. We have highlighted added/changed portion in our manuscript.

Regards,
Fariha Haseen

Comment 1. The last sentences at the end of the abstract and at the end of the discussion are pleonastic and should be dropped.

Response: We have dropped the last sentence.

Comment 2. On pages 3 and 10 Zylha should read Jyhla.

Response: We have made correction.

Comment 3. The introduction is still too long and not well focused on the rationale of the study. The second paragraph of the introduction is out of the context of the paper and should be dropped. Conversely, the authors should more clearly explain why would be important to investigate correlates of self-report health status in the Thai population? Would they expect different results as compared to previous studies?

Response: The 2nd paragraph was dropped. A new paragraph was added to explain the importance of the topic in the context of Thailand.

Comment 4. Analysis. Referee #2 suggested important improvement in the statistical analysis. In particular, he suggested to further explore the mutual relationship between different determinants by using structural equation model or using different and nested regression models. This is an important point for increasing the quality of the paper.

Response: The analysis was revised. We have used nested models.

Comment 5. Results. The description of Table 1 is too analytic and there is a big overlap between the table and the text. Please summarise the main findings of table 1, without reporting all the figures that are displayed in the table.

Response: The results were summarized in table 1.

6. Discussion. The limitations of the paper are not properly addressed.

Response: We have added some more limitation. The limitations of the paper were rewritten.