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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revision:
The title is not appropriate because it did not reflect the whole figures of this study and also it may cause readers misunderstanding as its general figure of India. I would suggest the authors revise it for example: Catastrophic health expenditure of chronic diseases among households in Kadagondanahalli, India.

In the introduction, the authors should provide brief information related health care system in that context instead of put it in some part of methods, and the authors should point out that why this is important to monitor and assess these aspects among population. Furthermore, The authors have to revise the objectives of this study as it reveals 3 main aspects i.e. OOP, catastrophe and impoverishment. As indicated in Page 4, it is NOT clear.

In the methods: Although the authors provide important information but I suggest the authors add more information especially those presented in the supplementary files. For example, the catastrophe and impoverish measurement (should the author briefly explain in this section for those who are not familiar with these measurement, rather than keep it in the supplementary documents).

In the result section:
The authors revealed findings and categorized into 3 section comprising OOP payments and consequences (catastrophe and impoverishment) which were appropriate, understandable-, and related to objectives of study. However, I would suggest the authors to revise tables and figures to enrich the paper to be well organized. For example Table 2 and fig. 3 could be merged, so in one table it can reveal both median percentage share of OOP and incidence of OOP across household quintiles. Table 3 provides less important information than other supplementary table such as Table S1 or S2. And please revise the text to be more concise and make the table consistent with. There are several studies related to this study, and the authors can borrow (but not plagiarize) some ideas to present these important findings.

Discussion:
- The authors often explain the findings with some discussion (eg. Page 11 para 3 etc), please revise.
- This study reveals catastrophe at different thresholds, please explain more and discuss on what the findings provide such information (not only use for
comparison with previous studies).

When the authors discuss about the potential explanation for the findings eg. OOP payments were made by medication, the user fees etc, the authors must provide the potential Implications of the present findings (point by point), after reading the whole story of discussion, I do not learn much as expected. Also, please do not overinterpret the findings and discuss beyond this study found, some references that used for explaining findings but just only the possible reason eg. Page 18 para 2.

Instead of the focus into the downstream of the health care delivery system, the authors should mention or discuss about the upstream especially when we currently have been discussing a lot in social determinants of health and its related with the health care system. To tackle the inequity in health care, what are the parts that should not be overlooked in your system or other context that could learn from you.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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