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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor

We are pleased to resubmit for publication the revised version of HRHE-D-17-00105R1 “Evaluation of Health Resources Utilization Efficiency in Community Health Centers of Jiangsu Province, China.” We appreciate the time, efforts and constructive criticisms by the chief editor, associate editors and reviewers in the manuscript. We have addressed all issues indicated in the review report, and believed that the revised version can meet the journal publication requirements. We will be glad to do further revision if our current effort falls short of the standards of work expected by the journal.

Response to Comments from Reviewer 1

We greatly appreciate the reviewer’s efforts to carefully review the paper and the valuable suggestions offered.

Comment 1

This observation was not addressed:
Page 3 Line 46: this paragraph is confusing, very wide and needs an English improvement. The paragraph occupies nearly one page and deals with many ideas. It should be rephrased and divided.

The paragraph beginning with (page11):

However, subsequent audit of post reform performance of China's healthcare system as shown in the China National ............... Until: and other indicators of health inequity favored the eastern provinces such as Jiangsu, Shanghai, Guangdong, Zhejiang, Shandong while patients in Tibet, Gansu, Xinjiang, Yunnan and Qinghai etc wallow in poverty.

This paragraph must be divided. It occupies nearly one page with several ideas. A structure like this one leaves the text hard to understand. Besides that, the paragraph must not start with the "however" expression. However, implies a change in positioning. This change was not previously linked to the phrase because de paragraph just started with the expression "however".

Response to Comment

Thank you very much for your comment. As you have suggested, we have thoroughly edited the manuscript. We sought the assistance of a native English speaker to help us in this regard. We have used track changes to show the extensive language editing that has been done. This occupies page 3 line 22 to Page 5 line 2

Comment 2

This request bellow must be addressed. The new phrase still needs to be rephrased. It has some parts not clear. "this study adopts belongs to the stream"
Comment 9:

Page 6: line 23: how the bed utilization give a good panorama of the health community centers? The health community centers perform admissions? In case of not, these statistics of bed utilization are not well aligned to the matter of the article.

Response to Comment

We are grateful for the observation. Firstly we have edited the language problem in this comment. In China, the community health centers perform admission unlike in other countries. We have accordingly reviewed the manuscript.

Comments 3

The study didn’t define which is its classification in epidemiological terms: observational or experimental? Descriptive or analytic? In case of being analytic cross-sectional, case control, cohort, ecological? There is insufficient information to presume the study classification considering that it involves a performance analysis through efficiency. The authors should address this point.

The response to comment 11 needs a little change. The response meets the requested changes, but the paragraph must be divided, once it nearly occupies one entire page.

You can separate the paragraph beginning from this phrase: Three methods were adopted to validate and assess trend and 13 standardization of initial 14 variables using SPSS Version 19

Thank you very much for pointing out this very important observation. We also appreciate your suggestion. We have revised according to the suggestions. Please see Page 6 line 22-27

Comment 4

The is some information missing at page 17 line 5: Charnes, Cooper and Rhodes (nnnnnnnn) recognized
Response to Comment

Thank you very much for pointing this out to us, we have corrected the mistake. The new sentence can be found on Page 6 Line 11 as follows:

Comment 5.

The DEa model coefficient must present in table format. It hard to understand which coefficient applies to each variable. The text bellow must be converted to a table, with a description of what each abbreviation means:

The fixed-coefficient as follows:

\[ \ln(ZLRC) = 66.7160 + 0.6397 \ln(RYS)_{NJ} - 0.0937n(CWS)_{NJ} + 0.5947\ln(CZTR)_{NJ} - 0.0789\ln(2 RYS)_{WX} + 0.2247\ln(CWS)_{WX} + 0.4234\ln(CZTR)_{WX} + 0.3222\ln(RYS)_{XZ} + 0.9501\ln(CWS)_{XZ} - 0.2323\ln(CZTR)_{XZ} - 2.0111\ln(RYS)_{CZ} - 0.4341\ln(CWS)_{CZ} + 0.8210\ln(CZTR)_{CZ} + 0.122 \]

\[ 3 XZ - 0.2323\ln(CZTR)_{XZ} - 2.0111\ln(RYS)_{CZ} - 0.4341\ln(CWS)_{CZ} + 0.8210\ln(CZTR)_{CZ} + 0.122 \]

\[ 4 8\ln(RYS)_{SZ} - 0.1508\ln(CWS)_{SZ} + 0.1548\ln(CZTR)_{SZ} - 0.3341\ln(RYS)_{NT} - 0.3718\ln(CWS)_{NT} + 0.6795\ln(CZTR)_{NT} - 0.8376\ln(RYS)_{LYG} + 1.3207\ln(CWS)_{LYG} - 0.0885\ln(CZTR)_{LYG} + 0 \]

\[ 5 \ln(RYS)_{HA} + 2.2226\ln(CWS)_{HA} - 0.3700\ln(CZTR)_{HA} + 0.15660n(RYS)_{YC} - 0.0232\ln(7 CWS)_{YC} + 0.3390\ln(CZTR)_{YC} + 3.5743\ln(RYS)_{YZ} - 1.4431\ln(CWS)_{YZ} + 0.4503\ln(CZTR)_{Y} \]

\[ 8 Z + 0.0514(RYS)_{ZJ} - 0.3428\ln(CWS)_{ZJ} + 0.2954\ln(CZTR)_{ZJ} - 0.2461\ln(RYS)_{TZ} + 1.2493\ln(C \]
Response to Comment

This observation is deeply appreciated. We have accordingly converted the information to table 1 as attached. The explanation for the variables are shown on Page 13 line 6 to 9

Comment 6

The conclusion new part needs English revision.

What this phrase tries to express? It’s not clear the main idea of the phrase. The observations made about efficiency of healthcare facilities in Jiangsu province and its implication on health equity in China as explained in this study are not peculiar to the Province. Other phrases and paragraphs of the new conclusion text need to be addressed to improve English quality.

Response to Comment

This observation is highly appreciated, we have doubled checked on the sentences. Please check Page 18 line 7 to Page 19 line 28

Response to Comments from Reviewer 2

A bit lengthy. 26 pages and be brought down to 18 or 20.

Response

Thank you very much for this observation. We have reduced the length of the manuscript from 26 pages to 23 pages.