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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

The topic on health services of China low income population is interesting, especially on women in child bearing period (aged 15-49). I have following major comments.

1. In this article, the study subjects covered not only the women aged 15-49, but also aged 50 and above. But the author compared some of the study results (such as antenatal care use and place of delivery) with that of other studies in which the study subject only included reproductive age women (aged 15-49). For example, the subjects of the third national household health survey and national family planning and reproductive health survey conducted in 2001 were the women aged 15-49 (these two articles were referred by the author in Reference no 9 and 12). When authors make comparison with other studies mentioned above, I strongly suggest that author only use the subjects aged 15-49. Actually, to study women aged 50 and above, particularly older women, say 70, or 80 is not so helpful for obtaining information to improve current women reproductive health and health care, because the relevant reproductive events might happen decades ago.

2. The author mentioned that “All statistical tests were two-sides and p<0.05 indicated significant differences, but did not specify which statistical method was used to do the test (Chi-square test or some others?)

3. In the last paragraph of page 11, I doubt that the number in the sentence “However, it was still higher than what has been reported in the rural areas of China (40.9%)”, it should be 85.6%. This number (85.6%) can be found in Reference no 9. I wan wondering why author did not use this indicator both for urban and rural areas from the same reference.

- Minor Essential Revisions

The title of the article seems not fully reflecting the content of the paper. If only looking at the title, readers might not consider that many contents of this article are concerning reproductive health care and family planning services.

- Discretionary Revisions
1. All eligible participants including men and women were randomly selected. 1025 men and 1870 women completed the questionnaire. In this study, only subjects of women were used for analysis. I would like to know if these 1870 women are good representative of all eligible low income women in the study area?

2. It is better to specify why the proportion of sample is 20% in the text.
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