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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. This is a well written article, and the questions posed by the author are well defined. However, the methods section is missing pertinent information that hindered my interpretation of the results. Due to the concerns described below, I felt unable to review the interpretations of the findings in the discussion section.

2. Specifically, without further description of how the weights, which were used to create a sample representative of the Region of Valencia, were incorporated into the analyses, I am unable to properly interpret the finding about the predictive value of self-rated health.

3. It is unclear how the percentages included in Table 1 were calculated, and the sample size of reported responses within the ‘Good’ and ‘Poor’ self-rated health categories contradict the findings reported in the results section.

4. Additionally, there is insufficient description and justification for the categorization of the socioeconomic variables, most notably self-rated income levels.

5. There is also no information included in the method or results sections about the number of cases that were excluded during the recoding of self-rated health because they responded ‘Don’t know’ or did not provide an answer. It is also unknown how many were excluded for missing other variables such as income.

6. The Results section is also missing statistical testing results commonly reported for multivariate logistic regression, such as the goodness of fit for the model.

Minor Revisions

1. Although there is quite a bit of presentation and discussion on the interesting gender differences in the results, gender is not mentioned in the title or abstract.

Comments

1. The discussion is thorough and covers many important points.

2. The methods are appropriate and well-defined, though some info is missing as stated above.

3. The authors address some limitations well.

4. The authors acknowledge background work supporting their study.
5. The writing is very clear in most places, though some information is missing as noted above.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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