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Reviewer's report:

The paper, which is mostly descriptive in nature, examines socioeconomic factors that correlate with disability, and the amount of disability compensation received. I thought the paper was interesting, especially the unique data source. I have a few small comments and suggestions.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. On page 4, what does ``compulsory but preferential" mean? Does this mean that the FHI offers more generous benefits, or smaller cost-sharing, compared to the NHI?

2. On page 5, was there a national health insurance program before the NHI was established in 1995?

3. On page 5, and elsewhere, I am not familiar with the notation NT$. Is this Taiwanese currency, or are these U.S. dollars? American readers will appreciate U.S. dollars, or at least a recent conversion rate, to gain a sense of magnitude, but for Taiwan public policy, Taiwanese currency might be of more importance.

4. I was a little baffled at the age of Taiwanese farmers. The lowest age dummy used in the analysis is $<45$, which seems appropriate given the sample means in Table 1. But why are Taiwanese farmers so old?

5. On page 12, doesn't the odds ratio of 1.64 mean *more* likely to receive payments, or am I misreading this?

6. On page 14, to me, the most interesting aspect of the paper is the role of the $\text{NHI}$ variable. Could the authors provide some interpretation into why this variable appears to induce more disability claims? Also, I think the ``Discussion" section might benefit from more policy discussion. For example, how can Taiwan policymakers use the results of this paper to, say, ease strain on the national budget?

7. Small point: The paper needs a close proofreading to eliminate a few grammatical errors.

Discretionary Revisions

1. On Page 13, my guess is that disability payments are log-normally distributed,
rather than normally distributed. If this is true, then the results in Table 3 might be sensitive to outliers (i.e., individuals who received large payments). A way to correct this would be to take the natural logarithm of the left-hand-side variable, and then the coefficients would be interpreted as percentage impacts on payments, rather than actual dollars. I am not suggesting that the authors make this change, because I like that Table 3 gives results in actual dollars. But it might be helpful to have a sentence somewhere noting that the results were robust to alternative approaches.

**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.
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