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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript addressed an important topic area in China. The data analysis is sound, and the results are interesting.

Given the study was conducted in Beijing, it might be more appropriate to revise the title using the term such as older residents in rural and urban Beijing, instead of “in urban and rural China.”

In the abstract, the authors stated that “chronic disease diagnoses were more prevalent.” Given the nature of the self-reported survey, I would not use the wording “diagnoses.”

The results are interesting and are consistent with findings from previous studies. Although the authors provide sound discussion on findings, I would be interested to see more discussion on the reason(s) that the prevalence of self-reported impairments are much lower in rural areas, and self-rated health was much better. Citing the reason as under-reporting or selective mortality may not fully explain this finding. Similarly, the discussion on caregiving stress may need more elaboration. Have these caregiving strain instruments been validated? Again, the perception of caregiving strain could be very different between these two settings.

The writing of the manuscript needs significant improvement. Some parts of the writing are unclear. In addition, the concepts and definitions that the authors introduced need more clarification. For example, the authors used the term “social protection.” Does this refer to informal long-term care arrangement? Similarly, it is unclear to me what the term “social care” (table 6) means.

In the methods section, a more detailed description on the data source would be helpful. For example, what is the purpose of the 10/66 study? If this study is described in greater detail elsewhere, refer the reader to that citation. In addition, how were these variables coded in the analysis? How was disability measured? What does the WHODAS II stands for?

The limitations of the work are not clearly stated. It is possible that urban and rural residents might understand or interpret the questions asked very differently, given the fact that there are many significant differences that exist between these two settings.
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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