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Reviewer's report:

The three main variables are measured by three questions/statements to be assessed on rating scales. The operational definitions of the items are well described, but the quality and the type of information gained from the response scales differ, which must be considered in the interpretation of the result.

Support for subsidized CHF is measures by assessments of agreement to a statement:

“Poor members ….should be facilitated to join the CHF without paying…”

The scale assessments refer to the LEVEL OF AGREEMENT TO THIS STATEMENT ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The amount of subsidized CHF…. is measured by assessments of the LEVEL OF AMOUNT OF SUBSIDY on a verbal descriptive scale the categories being none, some, half, most, all

The scales of willingness had five categories from definitely unwilling to definitely willing.

The second variable is assessed by five specified categories of amount ranging from none to all.

The third variable is assessed by five categories of willingness, two of them are negative, two positive and the third category is neutral.

The first variable has also a neutral category, but the assessments refer to the level of agreement to one specified statement, not to the level of the variable of interest.

Irrespective of the operational definitions the dependent variables are measured by assessments on scales which means that the data consist of sets of ordered categories with five possible alternatives. This fact is important to consider.
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