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Reviewer's report:

Authors cover an important topic of health financing which is relevant to achieving UHC. However, there are some suggestions and recommendations which need attention in order to strengthen the paper and make it more suitable for publication.

The title of your paper needs to be revised. Largely, there is disconnect between the study findings and the title though Table 4 relates somewhat.

Background

Authors need to offer cogent justification for the study.

Methods

It was indicated that mixed method was used in the study, which is misleading because clearly the study employed a qualitative approach. The use of desk review and qualitative research technique alone does not constitute mixed methods study design (which practically combines the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative approaches). Thus, it is important to clearly state, if it pertains to your study, what makes your research design mixed method. The choice of research design must be justified. State how does the methodological approach renders the results reliable.

Authors need to talk a bit more about the data collection process. Was the tool first developed in English and then translated to the local languages? If so, how was translation done? Which measures were used to ensure that content validity was not compromised significantly after the translation? Was the guide pretested prior to main interviews?

The analysis section focused more on what was done rather than how it was done. Refine the section by clearly highlighting how the analysis was done.

Results

Authors need to begin quotations on a new line and where possible reference the quotes e.g. …..(FMOH officer), …..(donor) etc.
Abbreviations were used frequently without proper definition. Authors need to address that by making sure that all abbreviations are appropriately well defined prior to use.

Consider replacing the word 'damaging' used in the results sub-section "Prevention of households from incurring damaging OOPs" with a more technically rigorous word e.g. catastrophic.

Discussions
What are the strengths and limitations of the study?

Conclusions
I think the conclusion should be re-written such that authors will reflect more on the key findings.

Other comments
The paper will benefit greatly from proofreading. There are a number of sentence construction issues that need attention e.g. data is plural and ought to be grammatically expressed as such e.g. data were….; Check language in P6 L107-109; not clear what is being said in P7, L122—125; not clear what is being said in P11, L216—218; check tense used in P15 L315-317 etc.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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