

# Review of: "A Prospective Study on Direct Out-of-Pocket Expenses of Hospitalized Patients with Acute Exacerbation of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in a Philippine tertiary care center"

Folashayo Adeniji

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an interesting study and a well written article. However, I have some comments that could potentially improve the quality of the study.

1. The authors should indicate if the Php 12,200 maximum coverage in terms of the financial coverage was included in the hospitalization cost used in the analysis. For instance, did the authors capture only OOP made by patients outside of the Php12,200 provision. This is not clear in the article.
2. Is the hospitalization cost the same as the out-of-pocket cost defined in the article? This is related to my comment in 1.
3. The use of > 20,000 as a cut-off appear arbitrary which is not the best practice. There are standard ways of measuring this. For instance, you can use the "Catastrophic Health Expenditure" concept.
4. I found it very strange that the authors decided to lump up the hospitalization costs associated with co-morbidities with the cost of acute exacerbation of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. This must have biased the cost estimates upwards which prevents readers from seeing the true picture of the cost. This is a major limitation.
5. Standard deviations should be reported using  $\pm$  and not +.
6. The numbers in the socio-demographics table do not add up. For instance, one observation was missing under the Age variable for the private service group. Please check. Check other variables too.
7. The average LoHS for the two groups are not the same as claimed by the authors. I suppose 8.5 is not the same as 8. Please check.
8. Report your results using past tenses.
9. Hospitalization cost per 1000 peros is not the right coinage. Just say values are reported in 1000 peros which can be indicated on the top of the Tables.
10. The discussion section is not detailed enough. The authors should add more discussions of the results.