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**Supplementary file 2.** Additional Results Based on the Longitudinal Sample
Table S5. Percentage share of households with catastrophic health care expenditure (measured as a share of total household consumption), pooled RLMS data, 2010-2017, longitudinal

|                | 10% threshold | 25% threshold | 30% threshold | 40% threshold |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| entire sample  | 6.30          | 1.19          | 0.75          | 0.34          |
| 2010           | 6.71          | 1.46          | 1.09          | 0.62          |
| 2011           | 6.83          | 1.18          | 0.68          | 0.28          |
| 2012           | 7.64          | 1.55          | 1.06          | 0.50          |
| 2013           | 6.83          | 1.49          | 0.90          | 0.28          |
| 2014           | 6.99          | 1.21          | 0.68          | 0.34          |
| 2015           | 5.50          | 1.18          | 0.87          | 0.47          |
| 2016           | 4.60          | 0.87          | 0.40          | 0.12          |
| 2017           | 5.28          | 0.56          | 0.31          | 0.09          |

Source/Notes: RLMS

Figure S7. Percentage share of households with catastrophic health care expenditure (measured as a share of total household consumption) and assessed against the relevant threshold, per income quintile, pooled RLMS data, 2010–2017, longitudinal.

Source/Notes: RLMS. The following values for the Pearson chi2 were reported: for the link between SES and 10% - Pearson chi2=43.87 (p=0.000), SES and 25% CHE threshold – Pearson chi2=17.576 (p=0.000), SES and 30% CHE threshold – Pearson chi2=14.268 (p=0.000), SES and 40% CHE thresholds – Pearson chi2=14.163 (p=0.000).
Figure S8. Distribution of households with respective expenditure on healthcare (as a share of total consumption), by income quintiles (in %), pooled RLMS data 2010–2017, longitudinal.

Source/Notes: RLMS. The following value for the Pearson coefficient are reported – Pearson chi2=107.112 (p=0.000).

Figure S9. Percentage share of households with catastrophic health care expenditure (measured as a share of total household expenditure) and assessed against the relevant threshold, per consumption quintile, pooled RLMS data 2010–2017, longitudinal.

Source/Notes: RLMS. The following values for the Pearson coefficient are reported: 25% threshold – Pearson chi2=17.425 (p=0.002), 30% - Pearson chi2=28.058 (p=0.000), 40% - Pearson chi2=37.419 (p=0.000)
Figure S10. Percentage share of households with catastrophic health care expenditure (measured as a share of healthcare expenditure in total expenditure minus food and total expenditure minus food, rent and utilities), per income quintile, pooled RLMS data 2010–2017, longitudinal.

Source/Notes: RLMS. The following values for the Pearson coefficient were obtained. When using 40% threshold of total expenditure less food, Pearson chi2=9.86 (p=0.042), while when using 40% threshold of total expenditure less food and utilities, Pearson chi2=21.445 (p=0.000)

Figure S11. Percentage share of households with catastrophic health care expenditure (as a share of income), per consumption quintile, pooled RLMS data 2010–2017, longitudinal.

Source/Notes: RLMS. The following values for the Pearson coefficient were obtained on the link between SES and CHE. When using the 10% threshold, Pearson chi2=72.892 (p=0.000), when using 25%, Pearson chi2=144.098 (p=0.000), when using 30% threshold, Pearson chi2=157.38 (p=0.000) and when using the 40% threshold, Pearson chi2=153.93 (p=0.000)
Table S6. Overshoot and mean positive overshoot of the CHE (measured as a share of total household consumption) per income quintile, (in %), pooled RLMS, 2010-2017, longitudinal

|                  | 10% threshold | 25% threshold | 30% threshold | 40% threshold |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Overshoot        | 0.6           | 0.14          | 0.09          | 0.04          |
| Mean positive overshoot | 9.1           | 11.77         | 12.33         | 11.89         |

|                  | 10% threshold | 25% threshold | 30% threshold | 40% threshold |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Overshoot by year |               |               |               |               |
| Overshoot - 2010 | 0.7           | 0.24          | 0.18          | 0.09          |
| Mean positive overshoot - 2010 | 10.49         | 16.68         | 16.71         | 15.91         |
| Overshoot - 2011 | 0.6           | 0.12          | 0.08          | 0.03          |
| Mean positive overshoot - 2011 | 8.82          | 10.89         | 12.28         | 12.92         |
| Overshoot - 2012 | 0.75          | 0.21          | 0.15          | 0.07          |
| Mean positive overshoot - 2012 | 9.9           | 14.02         | 14.31         | 14.4          |
| Overshoot - 2013 | 0.63          | 0.14          | 0.08          | 0.02          |
| Mean positive overshoot - 2013 | 9.26          | 9.44          | 9.1           | 8.8           |
| Overshoot - 2014 | 0.61          | 0.13          | 0.09          | 0.04          |
| Mean positive overshoot - 2014 | 8.74          | 11.19         | 13.41         | 12.01         |
| Overshoot - 2015 | 0.53          | 0.14          | 0.09          | 0.03          |
| Mean positive overshoot - 2015 | 9.78          | 12.42         | 10.9          | 7.73          |
| Overshoot - 2016 | 0.36          | 0.06          | 0.03          | 0.006         |
| Mean positive overshoot - 2016 | 7.96          | 6.86          | 7.24          | 5.22          |
| Overshoot - 2017 | 0.33          | 0.04          | 0.02          | 0.006         |
| Source/Notes: RLMS |
|-------------------|
| Table S7. Overshoot and mean positive overshoot of the CHE (measured as a share of total household consumption) per income quintile, (in %), pooled RLMS, 2010-2017, longitudinal |
| | 10% threshold | 25% threshold | 30% threshold | 40% threshold |
| Overshoot q1 | 0.37 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.02 |
| Mean positive overshoot – q1 | 7.92 | 11.53 | 10.96 | 9.65 |
| Overshoot q2 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.04 |
| Mean positive overshoot – q2 | 8.29 | 12.53 | 12.38 | 13.65 |
| Overshoot q3 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.08 | 0.04 |
| Mean positive overshoot – q3 | 8.28 | 10.64 | 13.39 | 16.46 |
| Overshoot q4 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.05 |
| Mean positive overshoot – q4 | 9.94 | 11.95 | 11.64 | 14.18 |
| Overshoot q5 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.16 | 0.07 |
| Mean positive overshoot – q5 | 11.07 | 13.92 | 14.36 | 10.08 |

Source/Notes: RLMS. The following values for the Pearson chi2 were reported: for the link between SES and 10% overshoot- Pearson chi2=41.0 (p=0.000), SES and 25% overshoot – Pearson chi2=14.75 (p=0.005), SES and 30% overshoot – Pearson chi2=11.62 (p=0.02), SES and 40% overshoot – Pearson chi2=11.45 (p=0.02).
Table S8. Impoverishing effects of OOP (poverty headcount, poverty gap and normalized poverty gap), (in %), pooled RLMS, 2010-2017, longitudinal

| Poverty headcount ratio gross of healthcare payments | Poverty headcount ratio net of healthcare payments | difference |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Poverty headcount | 0.2 | 0.4 | 1 | Poverty headcount | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1 | Poverty headcount | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Poverty gap | 0.9 | 1.9 | 3 | Poverty gap | 0.9 | 2.0 | 3 | Poverty gap | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Normalized poverty gap | 0.5 | 0.6 | 6 | Normalized poverty gap | 0.5 | 0.6 | 7 | Normalized poverty gap | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source/Notes: RLMS

Table S9. Impoverishing effects of OOP (poverty headcount, poverty gap and normalized poverty gap), (in %), pooled RLMS, 2010-2017, longitudinal

| Poverty headcount ratio gross of healthcare payments | Poverty headcount ratio net of healthcare payments | difference |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Poverty headcount | 0.3 | 0.5 | 1 | Poverty headcount | 0.3 | 0.5 | 1 | Poverty headcount | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Poverty gap | 1.1 | 1.9 | 3 | Poverty gap | 1.1 | 1.9 | 3 | Poverty gap | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Normalized poverty gap | 0.6 | 0.6 | 6 | Normalized poverty gap | 0.6 | 0.6 | 6 | Normalized poverty gap | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Poverty headcount | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0 | Poverty headcount | 0.1 | 0.4 | 1 | Poverty headcount | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Poverty gap | Normalized poverty gap | Poverty headcount | Normalized poverty headcount |
|------------|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| 0.8 2.1 5  | 0.0 0.0 0.0            | 0.2 0.5 1        | 0.0 0.0 0.2                |
| 0.4 0.6 6  | 0.0 0.0 0.0            | 0.9 2.1 4        | 0.0 0.0 0.1                |
| 0.5 0.7 6  | 0.0 0.0 0.0            | 0.2 0.4 8        | 0.0 0.1 0.2                |
| 0.8 1.9 1  | 0.0 0.0 0.0            | 0.2 0.4 3        | 0.0 0.0 0.2                |
| 0.4 0.6 6  | 0.0 0.0 0.0            | 0.2 0.2 0        | 0.0 0.0 0.2                |
| 0.8 1.2 4  | 0.0 0.0 0.0            | 0.2 0.2 3        | 0.0 0.0 0.2                |
| 0.4 0.4 6  | 0.0 0.0 0.0            | 0.5 0.4 7        | 0.1 0.0 0.2                |
| 0.2 0.4 6  | 0.0 0.0 0.0            | 0.2 0.5 1        | 0.1 0.1 0.3                |
|        | 2015 |        | 2015 |        | 2015 |
|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|
| Poverty gap | 0.6  | 1.7    | 0.6  | 1.7    | 0.6  |
| Normalized poverty gap | 0.3  | 0.5    | 0.7  | 0.1    | 0.0  |
| Poverty headcount | 0.2  | 0.5    | 0.2  | 0.5    | 0.2  |
| Poverty gap | 0.9  | 2.0    | 0.9  | 2.1    | 0.9  |
| Normalized poverty gap | 0.5  | 0.6    | 0.5  | 0.6    | 0.5  |
| Poverty gap | 0.6  | 2.1    | 0.8  | 2.1    | 0.8  |
| Normalized poverty gap | 0.3  | 0.6    | 0.4  | 0.7    | 0.4  |

Source/Notes: RLMS
### Table S9. Percentage share of households with unmet need (as reported in the survey), by type of healthcare service, pooled RLMS data, 2010-2017, longitudinal

| Year | Unmet dental care | Unmet pharmaceutical care | Unmet inpatient care | Unmet outpatient care |
|------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| entire sample | 9.16 | 6.79 | 3.75 | 2.99 |
| 2010   | 9.58 | 5.86 | 3.43 | 2.86 |
| 2011   | 6.77 | 5.48 | 3.15 | 2.22 |
| 2012   | 12.2 | 10.92 | 5.83 | 4.10 |
| 2013   | 8.88 | 5.84 | 3.04 | 2.56 |
| 2014   | 8.66 | 6.40 | 3.61 | 2.81 |
| 2015   | 9.82 | 7.12 | 3.35 | 2.97 |
| 2016   | 8.26 | 5.97 | 3.88 | 3.37 |

*Source/Notes:* RLMS. Note: the unmet need variables were not assessed in 2012.

### Figure S12. Percentage share of households with unmet need (as reported by the survey respondents), by income quintile and type of unmet need, pooled RLMS data 2010–2017, longitudinal.

*Source/Notes:* RLMS. The following values for the Pearson chi2 are reported. In case of unmet dental care and SES, Pearson chi2=78.28 (p=0.000), unmet need for medicines and SES, Pearson chi2=194.099 (p=0.000); unmet need for inpatient care and SES, Pearson chi2=36.33 (p=0.000); unmet need for outpatient care and SES, Pearson chi2=48.4
Figure S13. Percentage share of households with unmet need (defined as households who experience unmet need and incur zero healthcare expenditure) and unmet need for medicines and certain services, per income quintile, pooled RLMS data, 2010–2017, longitudinal.

Source/Notes: RLMS. The following values for the Pearson correlation coefficient are reported. In the case of unmet need and SES, Pearson $\chi^2=66.85$ ($p=0.000$), while in the case of unmet need for certain goods and services and SES, Pearson $\chi^2=71.53$ ($p=0.000$).