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Reviewer's report:

1. keywords: "80 and over" may not be appropriate as this study only includes 710 elders aged 60+. Related to this, please do not to be too certain about the national representativeness of such a sample with only 710 respondents.

2. Page 4, Last sentence before Methods Section: "The hypothesis is that there will be effect of the economic level over and above that of education" is unclear to me. Considering revising.

3. The authors noted that "The sample frame is the directory of dwellings' telephones." I just wonder (1) where is the telephone list from (a local public phonebook, or elsewhere)? (2) What is the proportion of local residents who do not have a dwelling phone (nowadays people may use cell phone and some household may have no phone)? If the proportion is not very high, it could produce biases for sampling as those households/persons who have a phone may tend to be in a better economic condition.

4. Page 5, Last paragraph before Statistical analysis: what does "never worked" mean? how about self-employment?

5. Page 6, middle paragraph: b) sentences should be rephrased and should not use "+" between different categories.

6. Page 9: the authors used “the probability” for ages at 85. To me, it is too scary to go beyond to age 80 as there should not be many respondents among 710 elders aged 60+. As the estimated probability is model-based, it should not be stressed after age 80. I also suggest dropping the line for age 85 in Figure 2. In Figure 2, what is the measuring unit for Y axis? In addition, the authors need to tell readers how this probability is calculated.

7. Page 12: The 1st paragraph should be enhanced to interpret the possible mechanism why the education loses its significance after controlling age and sex. Also, the last sentence needs more elucidation and/or citations to support it.

8. The authors reviewed some mechanism (mainly behavioral factors) linking between SES and health/disability. This is good and a correct way to do so. But I just wonder why the authors did not include some behavioral variables (if available) into modeling.

9. Some references are very old, dating back to the 1980s. It is better to cite the most recent ones.

10. English needs some editing.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.