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Reviewer’s report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a technically sound contribution?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:
GENERAL COMMENTS: Overall this paper seems to have a sound research question and appropriate methodology. Some minor comments to consider: 1) The introduction is far too long: it should be three paragraphs as a maximum. Some minor grammatical English errors can also be found throughout the manuscript. 2) Paragraph 1 of results: Make sure you are specific with which year you are referring to when describing these results. 3) Be specific when describing all results. For example, when describing CRD it is confusing to say that HALE didn’t decreased, but the gains in HALE after removing CRD were not as great in 2016 as they were in 1990 - I assume this is most likely because CRD is far less prevalent in 2016 than 1990, coinciding with declining smoking rates - which should be commented on. 5) in the discussion (paragraph #4), the authors suggest males will benefit more in terms of HALE by removing these 4 NCDS - when in fact, your data suggests females benefit the most. 6) Can the authors comment on the ethnic breakdown in China? Are there differences in regions/ethnicity? Are there data on differences such as rural vs. urban that could be explored to add to this manuscript? 7) include details of how CVD, DM, CRD and cancer are defined. 8) Are there any limitations with the model used for estimating HALE that should be acknowledged such as assumptions made, or the data used? 9) I think it is worth commenting that the greatest gains in HALE will occur by preventing NCDs in the youngest age groups. 60-69 for example may be the best group for targeted intervention.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

See my comments above

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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.
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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