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1) Abstract

sections saying government work is effective are not justified by the findings of perceived poor quality and high co-payments.

Answer: In the part, the words were not expressed clearly. We have modified it. Revised as follows: We found that a considerable proportion of farmers were satisfied with the NRCMS. Gender, age, and self-rated health status have significant effects on farmers’ attitudes towards the NRCMS. In the future, the Chinese Central Government will attempt to adopt active measures to continuously improve the NRCMS, including initiating educational programs, building new medical facilities and increasing financial investment.

Introduction

2) Unusual terminology. Many papers refer to CMS (1958-1980s), RCMS (township-pooled low-premium pilots that were tried in the 1990s and failed due to no govt funds) and NCMS (since 2002 State Council and CPC Central C’ tee regulation offering govt financial support). This section could be made more accurate for its history. The 1990s was a 'pilot period' to resurrect the CMS as RCMS and the 2002- period is the NCMS. I think the title should also change to NCMS (not NRCMS).

Answer: I have re-demarcated the stage of NCMS and verified the name of the stage of NCMS.

3) Ordinal regression model is unusual and hard to follow. Is Table 3 necessary? I think the co-efficient can be inserted into the text and explained - how much effect is due to each factor, and in what direction is the effect?

Answer: I have deleted Table 3

4) Figure 1 seems to duplicate Table 1 and if so can be deleted.

Answer: I have deleted it.

5) Table 2 numbers could be rounded off to one decimal point.

Answer: I have amended it.

6) Figure 3 is hard to understand and is not referred to in the results - should be deleted.

Answer: I have deleted it.
Discussion
7) second para - I disagree - surely women need the NCMS as much as men if not more

Answer: In rural China, men were largely engaged in agricultural work as the main labor forces and provide the main source of household income; while women were mainly responsible for household work. This gender difference in social roles resulted in different attitudes towards the NCMS and may explain different satisfaction rates between men and women.

8) third para - I think the elderly expect less, coming from a much poorer Generation

Answer: I agree with your opinion.

Conclusions
9) second para - where is the evidence that 'governments have adopted effective measures'? Reword this - governments are attempting to improve.....

Answer: I have amended it.

Answer  **Reviewer: DAVID CUNNINGHAM**

major compulsory revisions.

The authors use the descriptions 'rural residents' and 'farmers' as if they are identical. they are not, and the authors need to decide what is the population being studied. i.e. are they rural residents- people who live in rural areas, or are they farmers- people who run and operate farms

Answer: I have changed ‘farmers’ to 'rural residents' and the rural residents' are the people who live in rural areas.

there were numerous errors in written English. Most of these were small, but they accumulated throughout the paper and this does detract from the easy reading of the article. Some are likely due to lack of familiarity with English.
Examples are 1. variable tense - using past and present tense in the one sentence. Lack of use of the indefinite article: 'the'. Using 'countries' (page 3) when I think 'counties' was appropriate. Page 4: 'no medical insurance system exited' when I think they mean to say: 'existed'. This paper needs to be read and re-read by someone who is conversant with written English of a standard presented to a medical journal, and I don't think this would take long, or delay publication by much.

Answer: We have invited experts in the field of English to revise errors in written English.

The last paragraph in the introduction really belongs in the discussion section of the article, as the authors are discussing the results and methods of their own paper with one that describes research from another area - the city of Weihai.

Word usage is not consistent. E.g. page 7 the authors 'combined' two groups of responses (very satisfied and satisfied) but then 'integrated' two other groups (dissatisfied and very dissatisfied) it would be better if they used the same word -combined.

Answer: I have amended them.

The authors mention that the research consisted of interviews and focus groups, but no mention is made of what happened to the data that was collected in the focus groups, how this was analysed, and whether it contributes to this paper or to another paper. If not included in this paper, it should be mentioned by the authors.

Answer: I have conducted a supplementary explanation in the Part of Methods. The results of the interviews were in accordance with both aspects of satisfaction and dissatisfaction which were combined with the questionnaire to reach a final conclusion.

Answer Reviewer: Lorraine Wallace

Reviewer's report:
Major Compulsory Revisions
1. The manuscript needs to be extensively evaluated with a native English speaker and writer.
Answer: We invited an English expert----Jim Burgdorf who was proofread the manuscript. Jim Burgdorf has completed a BA in public policy and economics at the New College of Florida.

2. The Introduction is difficult to follow. Although the authors do a nice job of documenting the historical developments, several paragraphs are very short and this section is "choppy."

Answer: Introduction includes two parts contents: First, the history of the development of the NCMS; secondly, the innovative of the research which immediately following the three stages of development of the NCMS. We have the second part in its original foundation divided into two paragraphs: First for some scholars in this regard related research, second for the innovative of our study.

3. I suggest coming up with one specific study purpose.

Answer: We have already mentioned the study purpose in the article. It is By study, we can understand the performance, the sustainability and future improvements of the NCMS.

4. There is no need to identify statistical tests to be employed in the Introduction (this information should only be presented in the Methods section).

Answer: I have amended it.

5. Where both focus groups and questionnaires used to collect data? Please explain. Who conducted the interviews?

Answer: The sample of both focus groups and questionnaires is collected in Liaoning Province, including developed areas and less developed areas based on the economic conditions respectively. In 2007, the poverty level in Liaoning Province is determined as 2000 Yuan, compared to 4773 Yuan average per capita income in this province. Areas whose average income per capita is above (below) 2000 Yuan are regarded as developed (less developed) areas. 10 villages were randomly selected in each developed and less developed areas, which involved 3000 people aged 18–72, in our sample. Both in-home questionnaire and additional focus groups were conducted between 10th January and 20th August 2008 [16]. A total of 3000 questionnaires were distributed. 2780 questionnaires (92.66%) were returned. 26 questionnaires were not fully answered and considered void. In total, 2754 questionnaires
(91.80%) were included in this study.

In a typical interview, one expert held the interview and two professionals recorded conversation, expression and mood of the interviewees through the process. Informed consent was obtained from the participants before the interview.

6. Why did you elect to include the regression equations (see page 10)?

Answer: I have deleted it

7. What about additional study limitations?

Answer: In this study we have only carried out on cross-sectional studies, no longitudinal study. In addition, because of the Government regarding the new policy improving and the introduction of the new policy for our future, longitudinal studies have a certain impact.

8. 8
Minor Essential Revisions
1. Figure 1 is very difficult to interpret. This results may be better presented in tabular format.

Answer: Figure 1 seems to duplicate Table 1 and I have deleted it