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Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

1. This appears to be an epidemiologic study of health disparities in China using WHO SAGE data.

2. The conclusions will be helpful for policymakers by focusing on some of the modifiable correlates of identified health disparities.

3. There appears to be a discrepancy in table 1 concerning the number of chronic diseases in urban versus rural locations. The results section and discussion appear to indicate that the rural areas have an increased number of chronic diseases which correlates with poor self-rated health. Perhaps the Table 1 data for number of chronic diseases is transposed?

4. Lack of health insurance appears to be strongly associated with higher rates of functional limitation and poor self-rated health. This is a major policy consideration. Consider enhancing the discussion of this issue and providing some explanation of current availability and access to health insurance in China.

5. Typographical error page 4, … national representative survey "of" older adults…

6. Typographical error page 9, … more chronic "conditions"…

Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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