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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Page 7: The revised classification of poverty is not described fully. How to dichotomize as “poor” and “non-poor” from the revised classification?

Page 24: the revised classification (extremely poor, poor, moderately poor, not poor, not poor at all) in Table 1 is still confusables, particularly between: “poor” and “moderately poor” (which status is better?); “not poor” and “not poor at all” (These terms seem to be overlapped).

In addition, is “moderate” changed as “moderately poor”? If yes, this term “moderate” should be difficult to understand as “a moderate level of poor” for interviewees in data collection!

Is a more meaningful classification of poverty such as, extremely poor = 1; poor = 2; moderate = 3; not poor = 4; fair = 5 suitable to the nature of this research data?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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