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Dear Ms. Zapanta,

Thank you again for your and the reviewers’ comments. We appreciate the suggestions and we have made substantial language revisions.

We made point-by-point responses to all comments as the followings. Moreover, we revised the manuscript in a traceable way.

We look forward to receive your further advices and decision. Thank you very much.

Minxue Shen,
On the behalf of all authors
8 June 2015
Reviewer's report
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Version:3 Date: 27 May 2015
Reviewer: Nicola Diviani
Reviewer's report:
The authors have done a nice job in responding to my and the other reviewers' comments. I only have some minor comments.

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
1. The manuscript needs to be checked and edited by a native speaker or a professional proof-reader. Despite the edits, there are still several unclear sentences.
   Reply: Thank you for the suggestion. The manuscript has been checked and edited by a native language speaker. A lot of language revisions have been made in a traceable way. Please check the revisions in manuscript.

Discretionary Revisions
2. I think the authors should at least mention the third implication of their results, as they outlined in the response to my comment. It is an interesting implication and it could be described as a suggestion for future research.
   Reply: Thank you for the suggestion. Now we mentioned the implication as “Thirdly, the instruments used in national health literacy survey in 2008 and 2012 are different. Therefore, direct comparison based on the raw scores will be inappropriate. In this study, IRT provided an opportunity for longitudinal comparison.”

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report
Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests