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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed my substantive concerns regarding the paper, although they have not as far as I can see addressed some of the more minor ones. This may be partly an issue of language - I think the paper needs a careful English edit.

The more minor points that have not been addressed sufficiently in my view are:

a) point 1c) in my original report (major essential revisions). The authors state that counties were 'purposively' selected but do not give the criteria for selection.

b) Point 1a) in my original report (minor essential revisions) - the revision aiming to address the issue of the changing policy on contribution rates is still unclear.

c) Point 1b) in my original report (minor essential revisions) - the revision regarding levels of compensation is still not very clear - it needs to be clear that this is the ceiling on reimbursement not the expected level of reimbursement.

d) Point 2 a) in my original report (minor essential revisions) - this point has not been addressed in any way that I can see.

e) Point 2c) in my original report (minor essential revisions) - the reasons for rejecting the utility of pilot schemes to integrate rural and urban schemes are still not very clearly expressed.

f) Point 3a) in my original report (minor essential revisions) - this has not been done

g) Point 3 b) in my original report (minor essential revisions) - this has not been done

h) The authors have added some international literature, but I am not sure of the value of the study from the US quoted since this refers to international immigrants, who face very different issues than internal migrants in China, not least of which that they are not necessarily US citizens - this is a very important point since it is the citizenship entitlements of Chinese internal migrants that is at issue regarding health insurance and universal coverage.

Most (but not all) of these points are due to lack of clarity in English expression and just require some English editing input. There are a couple of important English errors that also jumped out at me - 1) on page 7 of my revised copy, line 12, I think 'disputable' should read 'indisputable'; 2) The use of 'therefore' to start paragraph 3 on page 8 seems inappropriate given the changed content of the
previous paragraph. There are many more that need identifying and correcting.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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