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**Reviewer’s report:**

**General remark**
The paper improved a lot by the latest revision.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**
1. Complete Paper: In your reply you emphasized that you used exchange rates for converting Chinese Yuan - RMB into US$.
   a. Are your cost figures (e.g. lines 134, 136,...) based on daily exchange rates or yearly average rates? Using a daily exchange rate might be a severe problem because of fluctuation
   b. which source did you use?
   c. Were your analyses based on the Chinese currency or on US$?
   d. Did you really use the same conversion rate for both years?
2. You should carefully interpret the results from your estimation. Including some numbers in table 3 is not enough.

**Minor Essential Revisions**
1. Methods: Sampling and sample size (lines 137-148): It is not clear, if you did that work by your own, or not. If “not”, please include references
2. Methods: Please harmonize/ rearrange the sections “Sampling and sample size”, “Questionnaire” and “data collection”. I recommend defining a section “data collection”, in which these aspects are described in a logical and consistent way

**Discretionary Revisions**
1. Abstract & Introduction: Estimation of the change in household catastrophic care expenditures (line 42 AND line 118): The reader gets still the impression, that within the paper the expenditure change is analysed for each household. Perhaps you should include the word “overall” in the corresponding sentence
2. Abstract + Conclusions: “Although health systems have made great improvements in alleviating CHE” (line 406) – a) is this really a part of the conclusion you draw from your own study? b) the statement is not concrete enough.
3. Results – line 289 – replace “possibility” by “probability”
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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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