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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. This manuscript describes a cross-sectional survey to estimate the burden and identify the correlates of NCDs in rural China. 6003 rural residents aged 15 and above from 36 villages of Shijiazhuang in Hebei province of China completed a self-administered questionnaire. The sample is large, but the authors did not introduce how or based what the counties, the villages were selected? And how these participants were recruited? What random sampling methods were used in the study? If this was a representative sample of rural residents from these sites? These should be clarified under Methods.

2. Please clarify what the response rate was of your study, as it is unclear if 6003 rural residents were recruited, why the total numbers of certain variables were not consistent, such as “Exercise in last 12 months”, “Weight change in last 12 months” in Table 1?

3. I wonder why so these age ranges were used. According to the definition of United Nations and China, the persons aged 65 and above are classified as the elderly. As we all know, the elderly are more vulnerable to chronic diseases, why did not you analyze the prevalence of NCDs among the elderly group?

4. The author mentioned in the Method that “simple ordinal logistic regressions were performed for univariate analysis [Odds ratio (OR) and 95%CI]. However, there were no such results in the manuscript.

5. The Abstract is reasonable. Unfortunately there are problems with some expressions. Besides, the conclusions should be rewritten taking into account the nature of the study.

6. As this study was performed in 2010~2011, please also report in the discussion whether there have been any changes since then, or the refreshed data is required.

Minor Essential Revisions

7. The aim of the study was not clear, and this should be clarified under Introduction.

8. Page 10, Paragraph 1: This is difficult to understand. 5th para 1th sentence
onward: This should be written more clearly.

9. There are a number of sentences with grammatical errors which should be corrected by a first language English speaker or copy-editor.

10. Results vary in presentation and in tables with one or two decimal places – be consistent, I would use one decimal place throughout.

Discretionary Revisions

11. The authors mentioned under Result: “participants with family history (COR=1.18, 95%CI: 1.07-1.30; AOR=1.08, 95%CI: 0.98-1.20) had higher odds of having more NCDs”, “daily smokers (COR=1.18, 95%CI: 1.05-1.33; AOR=1.06, 95%CI: 0.90-1.23)…… had higher odds of suffering from more NCDs”. However, the data indicated a non statistical significance results, then the authors should consider whether the results were meaningful.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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