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Reviewer's report:

The paper interrogates social inequalities in access to and use of preventive medical services in China. Social inequalities in prevention appear to be a large source of inequalities in health, especially when dealing with diseases for which effective preventions exist. To date, few studies have examined the impact of such inequalities in relation to health insurance, and fewer have done this in lower or middle income countries. None to date, to this reviewer’s knowledge, has specifically examined all of these together in China. This is an interesting paper and it will be well examined. I will send it around as well to my list. The quality of the written English is much improved, but would still benefit from a clear once-through. The paper is sturdy, though and would be well received, resulting in my suggestion that you accept the paper.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes.

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
   Tables, no figures.

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Reporting, yes. I'm not sure about the data deposition standards.

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes.

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes.

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building,
both published and unpublished?
Yes, they do a good job - it’s reading more clearly now and they are more aware and referential of the existing international work in the area.

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes.

10. Is the writing acceptable?
It is much better - it could still use a detailed editing as there are some places where the authors’ ESL background shows through (as an ex-ESL teacher in China, though, it’s likely that I’m particularly attuned to these). For example, though, in the limitations section: “First, eastern region is over-represented in the study sample.” should be “First, this study over-represents individuals residing in Eastern China.” Also, the final version could make better use of headings so that the reader is aware of where they are and what they are reading about.