

# Urban-rural differences in catastrophic health expenditure among households with chronic non-communicable disease patients: evidence from China Family Panel Studies

Xian-zhi Fu (✉ [1371810134@qq.com](mailto:1371810134@qq.com))

Wuhan University <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2246-1564>

Qi-wei Sun

Heilongjiang Provincial Higher People's Court

Chang-qing Sun

Zhengzhou University

Fei Xu

Zhengzhou University

Jun-jian He

Zhengzhou University

---

## Research

**Keywords:** Catastrophic health expenditure, Fairlie nonlinear decomposition, Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition, China

**Posted Date:** October 7th, 2020

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-37742/v2>

**License:**  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

---

**Version of Record:** A version of this preprint was published at BMC Public Health on May 6th, 2021. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10887-6>.

1 **Urban-rural differences in catastrophic health expenditure**  
2 **among households with chronic non-communicable disease**  
3 **patients: evidence from China Family Panel Studies**

4 **Abstract**

5 **Background:** The prevalence of chronic non-communicable diseases  
6 (NCDs) challenges the Chinese health system reform. Little is known  
7 for the differences in catastrophic health expenditure (CHE) between  
8 urban and rural households with NCD patients. This study aims to  
9 measure the differences above and quantify the contribution of each  
10 variable in explaining the urban-rural differences.

11 **Methods:** The second and the fourth waves of the China Family Panel  
12 Studies (CFPS) data, conducted in 2012 and 2016, were employed in  
13 this cross-sectional study. The techniques of Fairlie nonlinear  
14 decomposition and Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition were employed to  
15 measure the contribution of each independent variable to the urban-  
16 rural differences.

17 **Results:** The CHE incidence and intensity of households with NCD  
18 patients were significantly higher in rural areas than in urban areas.  
19 The explained disparity of CHE incidence increased from 3.15% in  
20 2012 to 27.04% in 2016, and the corresponding values of CHE  
21 intensity rose from 21.30% in 2012 to 53.37% in 2016. The major

1 contribution to the urban-rural differences in CHE was associated  
2 with household economic status, education level, health status and  
3 supplementary medical insurance (SMI).

4 **Conclusions:** Compared with urban households with NCD patients,  
5 rural households with NCD patients have higher risk of incurring CHE  
6 and heavier economic burden of diseases. Policy interventions should  
7 give priority to decreasing the urban-rural disparity in observable  
8 characteristics mentioned above.

9 **Keywords:** Catastrophic health expenditure, Fairlie nonlinear  
10 decomposition, Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition, China.

## 11 **1. Background**

12 Achieving universal health coverage, defined as ensuring that all  
13 people have access to essential health services without suffering  
14 financial constraints by 2030, is one of the key targets of the  
15 sustainable development goals (SDGs) [1, 2]. However, a global  
16 monitoring report released by the WHO and World Bank reflects the  
17 situation of “poverty caused by illness” in the global population in  
18 2017: (1) more than 122 million people were classified as "poor"  
19 (living on less than \$3.10 a day) due to health care expenditure; (2)  
20 about 100 million people were pushed into "extremely poor" (living  
21 on less than \$1.90 a day) because they have to pay for health care [3].

1 With the prevalence of chronic non-communicable diseases (NCDs)  
2 accompanied by accelerated population aging, increasing number of  
3 individuals worldwide will suffer from catastrophic health  
4 expenditure (CHE) in the future.

5 As the global epicenter of NCDs epidemic, China is under great  
6 pressure. A 2005 study estimated that NCDs had become the leading  
7 cause of death and disease burden in China, accounting for 80% of  
8 deaths and 70% of disability-adjusted life-years lost [4]. In 2015,  
9 NCDs contributed to 86.6% of all deaths and 70% of the total disease  
10 burden in China [5]. The heavy burden of NCDs has greatly increased  
11 the economic risks for many vulnerable groups in China.

12 The fundamental functions of a health system is not only to  
13 promote access to essential health care services, but also to improve  
14 the ability of households to withstand the financial catastrophe  
15 associated with illness [6]. The Chinese health system has been  
16 working to protect vulnerable households against CHE. In 2009,  
17 China's new round of health system reform involved a series of policy  
18 measures, including the reduction of out-of-pocket (OOP) medical  
19 expenditure and expansion of basic health care coverage by 2020 [7,  
20 8]. Three types of basic medical insurance schemes, including the  
21 Urban Employee Basic Medical Insurance, Urban Residents Basic

1 Medical Insurance and New Rural Cooperative Medical Scheme, have  
2 been established to decrease the financial burden of NCDs on  
3 households. In 2013, more than 95% of residents were covered by  
4 basic medical insurance in China, which was a sign of universal  
5 coverage of basic medical insurance [9, 10]. In addition,  
6 supplementary medical insurance (SMI), including commercial  
7 medical insurance, public servant medical subsidy, enterprise  
8 supplementary medical subsidy, employee medical subsidy for large  
9 medical expenses, and employee mutual medical insurance, was  
10 established to meet the needs of residents for multiple levels of  
11 health services [11]. However, there was still evidence that medical  
12 expenditure due to NCDs played an important role in the main causes  
13 of poverty among rural households in China [12]. As NCDs are  
14 characterized by long treatment duration and high treatment costs  
15 [13], substantial financial hardships create obstacles to health  
16 services utilization for rural households with NCD patients in China,  
17 leading to further escalation of health problems. Therefore, it is  
18 necessary and urgent to pay attention to the CHE among rural  
19 households with NCD patients.

20 Several researches have investigated the financial catastrophe  
21 among individuals or households suffering from NCDs around the

1 world. Three existing studies emphasized that households with NCD  
2 patients were in the high risk to incur CHE in China, Korea and Iran  
3 [9, 14, 15]. Gwatidzo (2017) found that adults aged 50 or above in  
4 India were less likely to incur CHE due to diabetes mellitus  
5 medication use compared to China [16]. Zhao (2019) identified that  
6 the CHE incidence among rural households with NCD patients  
7 notably exceeded the average level of urban households with NCD  
8 patients in China [17]. Xie (2017) verified the main reasons why  
9 households with members suffering from NCDs in rural China were  
10 prone to CHE [18]. To sum up, most of the studies have explored the  
11 CHE of households with NCD patients in rural areas of a country or in  
12 a whole country. However, there is still a lack of discussion on the  
13 urban-rural differences in CHE among households with NCD patients  
14 and its influencing factors. In addition, understanding the urban-rural  
15 differences in the financial risks of NCD medical expenses and the  
16 factors related to the differences can prompt more effective efforts to  
17 reduce the economic risk of rural households with NCD patients.

18 The objectives of this study were as follows: (1) to measure the  
19 extent of CHE for urban and rural households with NCD patients, (2)  
20 to examine the urban-rural differences in the degree of CHE between  
21 the two groups, and (3) to quantify the contribution of each variable

1 to the urban-rural differences.

## 2 **2. Methods**

### 3 2.1. Data source

4 This study was based on a publicly available database, the  
5 China Family Panel Studies (CFPS), which was conducted by the  
6 Institute of Social Science Survey (ISSS) of Peking University every  
7 two years from 2010 to 2016. The CFPS used a three-stage,  
8 stratified, probability-proportional-to-scale (PPS) random sampling  
9 method to select sample from twenty-five provinces in China. It  
10 was representative that the sample of CFPS representing 94.5% of  
11 the population in mainland China [19]. The questionnaire for CFPS  
12 involved a wide range of variables, such as demography  
13 characteristics, socioeconomic status, health status, health services  
14 utilization, family relationships and medical insurance and so on.

15 We used the second and the fourth waves of cross-sectional  
16 data from CFPS, which involved 13,315 households in 2012 and  
17 14,019 households in 2016, respectively. The inclusion criteria for  
18 the interviewed households were as follows: (1) having completed  
19 information; and (2) having members with NCDs. In this survey,  
20 NCDs were determined by whether a respondent had been

1 diagnosed by a doctor within the previous six months? Finally,  
2 2,871 households with NCD patients in 2012 and 4,065 households  
3 with NCD patients in 2016 were specialized in this study, including  
4 1,348 households in urban areas and 1,523 households in rural  
5 areas in 2012, and 1,982 households in urban areas and 2,083  
6 households in rural areas in 2016.

## 7 2.2. Measurement of CHE

8 We referred to the studies of Wagstaff and van Doorslaer to  
9 determine the relevant indicators of measuring CHE [20, 21]. OOP  
10 medical expenditure only included direct medical expenditure made  
11 by any household members, and excluded indirect expenditure  
12 related to seeking health services (e.g., transportation, food,  
13 accommodation, lost productivity due to illness). Since the  
14 substitution of non-food household expenditure for total household  
15 expenditure partly avoided the measurement deviations that were  
16 often overlooked in poor households, we used non-food household  
17 expenditure as the denominator to calculate CHE [22, 23]. The non-  
18 food expenditure of a household is defined as the portion of total  
19 household expenditure excluding food household expenditure.  
20 According to exiting literature [17, 22, 24, 25], the threshold for CHE  
21 was defined as 40%. More specifically, if OOP medical expenditure of

1 a household exceeded 40% of its non-food household expenditure,  
 2 the household was classified as incurring CHE. A binary variable was  
 3 defined to determine whether a household experienced CHE or not,  
 4 as shown in formula (1):

$$E_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \frac{T_i}{(x_i - f_i)} < \text{threshold} \\ 1 & \text{if } \frac{T_i}{(x_i - f_i)} \geq \text{threshold} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

5 where  $T_i$  means the OOP medical expenditure of household  $i$ ,  $x_i$   
 6 is the total expenditure of household  $i$ ,  $f_i$  stands for the food  
 7 expenditure of household  $i$ , and threshold is defined as 40%. The  
 8 calculation of CHE incidence and intensity can be specified as below:

$$H = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E_i \quad (2)$$

$$O = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E_i \left( \frac{T_i}{(x_i - f_i)} - z \right) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N O_i \quad (3)$$

$$MPO = \frac{O}{H} \quad (4)$$

9 where  $N$  represents the total sample size,  $H$  means the CHE  
 10 incidence in the overall sample. CHE intensity is estimated by  
 11 overshoot and mean positive overshoot (MPO).  $O$  stands for  
 12 overshoot, which is the average percentage of OOP medical  
 13 expenditure that exceeds a given threshold in the overall sample [26].

1 MPO indicates the average percentage of OOP medical expenditure in  
2 excess of the threshold among households incurring CHE [20]. The  
3 higher values of overshoot and MPO both stand for heavier financial  
4 burden of diseases for the household.

### 5 2.3. Definitions of independent variables

6 Referring to the previous reports, we included the  
7 characteristics of each household and its household head into the  
8 regression model as independent variables [22, 23, 27-29].  
9 Households characteristics involved eight variables: the annual  
10 household income per capita, household size, receiving inpatient  
11 services, having members below 5 years old, having elderly members,  
12 having members covered by basic medical insurance, having  
13 members covered by SMI, and geographic location. The  
14 characteristics of household head involved four variables: gender,  
15 education, marriage, and self-assessed health status. We used the  
16 natural logarithm of the annual household income per capita to  
17 measure economic status of a household. Table 1 presents the  
18 detailed descriptions of the above independent variables.

### 19 2.4. Methodology

20 The Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition technique, proposed by

1 Blinder and Oaxaca [30, 31], was applied in this study to analyze the  
2 contribution of each independent variable to the urban-rural  
3 differences in CHE. The implementation of decomposition analysis  
4 needs to be based on the relationship between CHE and a series of  
5 independent variables.

6 As CHE incidence ( $E_i$ ) is a binary variable, probit model is  
7 applied to estimate the effect of the independent variables on the  
8 CHE incidence. The specific regression model is shown below:

$$Y^\gamma = F(X^\gamma \beta^\gamma) \quad (5)$$

9 where  $F$  represents the cumulative distribution function of the  
10 standard normal distribution, superscript  $\gamma$  represents the rural or  
11 urban households,  $Y$  is the CHE incidence,  $X$  stands for the  
12 independent variables, and  $\beta$  denotes the regression coefficient.

13 Fairlie extended the technique of Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition  
14 to the application of nonlinear model [32, 33]. Given the probit  
15 regression model is a nonlinear regression model, this study  
16 employed the method of Fairlie nonlinear decomposition to  
17 decompose the urban-rural differences in CHE incidence between  
18 two groups into two components:

$$\bar{Y}^R - \bar{Y}^U = \underbrace{\left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N^R} \frac{F(X_i^R \beta^R)}{N^R} - \sum_{i=1}^{N^U} \frac{F(X_i^U \beta^R)}{N^U} \right]}_{\text{Explained part}} + \underbrace{\left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N^U} \frac{F(X_i^U \beta^R)}{N^U} - \sum_{i=1}^{N^U} \frac{F(X_i^U \beta^U)}{N^U} \right]}_{\text{Unexplained part}} \quad (6)$$

1        Where superscript R represents the rural households,  
 2        superscript U means the urban households.  $\bar{Y}$  does not necessarily  
 3        equal  $F(\bar{X}\beta)$ . The first term in formula (6) stands for the explained  
 4        part of the urban-rural differences between two groups, which is  
 5        caused by the disparity in distribution of independent variables, and  
 6        the second term represents the unexplained part due to the disparity  
 7        in regression coefficient [34].

8        The detailed decomposition involves a natural one-to-one  
 9        matching of cases between the two groups to identify the  
 10       contribution of independent variables. The subsample was drawn  
 11       from the majority group (rural households), and matched the  
 12       minority group (urban households) based on the ranking of CHE  
 13       incidence. The contribution of variable  $X_1$  to the urban-rural  
 14       differences in CHE incidence is estimated as follows:

$$\frac{1}{N^U} \sum_{i=1}^{N^U} F(\alpha^* + X_{1i}^R \beta_1^* + X_{2i}^R \beta_2^*) - F(\alpha^* + X_{1i}^U \beta_1^* + X_{2i}^R \beta_2^*) \quad (7)$$

1 Where  $\beta^*$  stands for the regression coefficient from the probit  
 2 model for the overall sample. It should be noted that the results are  
 3 sensitive to the order of independent variables in the decomposition  
 4 of nonlinear model [34]. Following Fairlie [33], independent  
 5 variables were randomly ordered in the decomposition of nonlinear  
 6 model. This study repeated the above steps 1000 times to obtain the  
 7 average value of decomposition results, representing the  
 8 contribution of each independent variable.

9 Similarly, the contribution of  $X_2$  to the urban-rural differences in  
 10 CHE incidence is calculated as follows:

$$\frac{1}{N^U} \sum_{i=1}^{N^U} F(\alpha^* + X_{1i}^U \beta_1^* + X_{2i}^R \beta_2^*) - F(\alpha^* + X_{1i}^U \beta_1^* + X_{2i}^U \beta_2^*) \quad (8)$$

11 In addition, since the CHE intensity ( $O_i$ ) is a continuous variable,  
 12 multiple linear regression is used to analyze the factors affecting the  
 13 CHE intensity. The specific regression model can be written as:

$$Y^\gamma = X^\gamma \beta^\gamma + \varepsilon^\gamma \quad (9)$$

14 where  $Y$  represents the CHE intensity,  $X$  stands for a vector of  
 15 independent variables,  $\beta$  is a vector of regression coefficient  
 16 including intercept, and  $\varepsilon$  denotes the random error term.

17 The contribution of each independent variable to the urban-  
 18 rural differences in CHE intensity between two groups was divided

1 into two components using two-fold Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition  
2 approach [35, 36]:

$$\bar{Y}^R - \bar{Y}^U = \underbrace{(\bar{X}^R - \bar{X}^U)\beta^*}_{\text{Explained part}} + \underbrace{[\bar{X}^R(\beta^R - \beta^*) + \bar{X}^U(\beta^* - \beta^U)]}_{\text{Unexplained part}} \quad (9)$$

3 Where  $\beta^*$  denotes the regression coefficient from the multiple  
4 linear regression for the overall sample,  $\bar{X}$  represents the  
5 corresponding covariate means of the independent variables. The  
6 first term indicates the explained part, representing the contribution  
7 attributable to group disparity in distribution of independent  
8 variables, and the second term indicates the unexplained part,  
9 representing the contribution attributable to group disparity in  
10 regression coefficient.

11 All statistical analyses were performed in STATA software  
12 version 15.1, and  $p < 0.05$  was considered statistically significant.

### 13 **3. Results**

#### 14 3.1. Descriptive statistics

15 Table 2 shows the summary statistics for general  
16 characteristics of the urban and rural households with NCD  
17 patients. The annual household income per capita of urban and  
18 rural households were 18,513.86 CNY and 9,538.07 CNY in 2012,  
19 rising to 29,905.45 CNY and 16,110.23 CNY in 2016. In both 2012

1 and 2016, the mean household size in rural areas was greater than  
2 that in urban areas. Meanwhile, the rural households had higher  
3 probability in receiving inpatient services in the last 12 months,  
4 having children below 5 years old, having elderly members,  
5 having basic medical insurance, and having married household  
6 head than urban households. With respect to the coverage of SMI,  
7 the proportions of households having SMI were higher in urban  
8 areas in comparison with the rural areas in 2012 and 2016. The  
9 percentages of households having female household head were  
10 higher in urban areas than in rural areas. The proportion of urban  
11 households located in the east is the highest, and the percentages  
12 of rural households located in the west is the highest. Among  
13 urban households, household heads of education achievement of  
14 high school and above had the highest proportion, while among  
15 rural households, household heads of education level of illiterate  
16 had the highest percentage.

### 17 18 3.2. CHE incidence and intensity.

19 Table 3 illustrates CHE incidence and intensity of urban and  
20 rural households with NCD patients. In 2016, 19.88% of  
21 households in urban areas experienced CHE. Meanwhile, the

1 overshoot of urban households was 4.39% in 2016, suggesting  
2 that the average percentage of OOP medical expenditure that  
3 exceeded the given threshold over all urban households was  
4 4.39%. The MPO for urban households was 22.08% in 2016,  
5 meaning that if the burden of overshoot was divided equally by all  
6 urban households incurring CHE, the average extent of exceeding  
7 given threshold was 22.08%. Each of the other row could be  
8 interpreted in a similar pattern for rural/urban households with  
9 NCD patients in 2012/2016.

### 10 3.3. Associated factors of CHE incidence.

11 Table 4 presents the probit regression results for factors  
12 associated with the CHE incidence in urban and rural households  
13 with NCD patients. Household size and education attainment of  
14 household head significantly decreased the CHE incidence, while  
15 receiving inpatient services in the last 12 months and having  
16 elderly members significantly increased the occurrence of  
17 exposure to CHE. Economic status was negatively correlated with  
18 CHE incidence, but the correlation was not statistically significant  
19 in the sample of rural households in 2012. The geographic location  
20 of central and west significantly reduced the CHE incidence of  
21 rural households in 2016. Meanwhile, the geographic location of

1 west was negatively correlated with CHE incidence of rural  
2 households in 2012. Poor self-assessed health status of household  
3 head significantly increased the CHE incidence for urban  
4 households in 2012 and for rural households in 2016. Basic  
5 medical insurance and SMI did not affect CHE incidence at a  
6 significant level.

### 7 3.4. Associated factors of CHE intensity.

8 The associated factors of the CHE intensity ( $O_i$ ) are shown in  
9 Table 5. Economic status and household size significantly reduced  
10 the CHE intensity, while receiving inpatient services in the last 12  
11 months and having elderly members significantly increased the  
12 CHE intensity. The geographic location of central and west  
13 significantly decreased the CHE intensity of rural households in  
14 2016. Meanwhile, the geographic location of west was negatively  
15 associated with CHE intensity of rural households in 2012.  
16 Education of household head was negatively associated with CHE  
17 intensity, but did not significantly affect the CHE intensity of rural  
18 households in 2012. Poor self-assessed health status of household  
19 head significantly increased the CHE intensity of rural households.  
20 Basic medical insurance and SMI did not affect CHE intensity at a  
21 significant level.

1 3.5. Aggregate decomposition.

2 Table 6 displays the results for aggregate decomposition of  
3 the urban-rural differences in CHE incidence and intensity ( $O_i$ )  
4 among households with NCD patients.

5 The explained disparity of CHE incidence increased from 3.15%  
6 in 2012 to 27.04% in 2016, and the corresponding values of CHE  
7 intensity rose from 21.30% in 2012 to 53.37% in 2016.

8 3.6. Decomposition of contribution of all explanatory variables.

9 The urban-rural differences in CHE incidence and intensity  
10 ( $O_i$ ) among households with NCD patients is further decomposed  
11 into the contribution of each variable, as shown in Table 7 and  
12 Table 8.

13 With respect to the urban-rural differences in CHE incidence  
14 in 2012, the explained part was mainly attributed to household  
15 size (-31.49%), geographic location (west, -17.00%), and  
16 education of household head (middle school, 5.79%; high school  
17 and above, 27.46%). The main contribution to the explained  
18 disparity in CHE incidence in 2016 was associated with economic  
19 status (29.80%), household size (-33.22%), geographic location  
20 (west, -18.73%), gender of household head (4.72%), education of

1 household head (middle school, 5.54%), and self-assessed health  
2 status of household head (poor, 19.06%).

3 With regard to the explained disparity of CHE intensity in  
4 2012, the main contributors were economic status (36.90%),  
5 household size (-37.08%), geographic location (west, -18.75%),  
6 gender of household head (6.76%), education of household head  
7 (primary school, -5.97%; middle school, 4.46%; high school and  
8 above, 21.62%), and self-assessed health status of household head  
9 (poor, 6.62%). In 2016, the explained disparity in CHE intensity  
10 was mainly associated with economic status (47.19%), household  
11 size (-34.78%), SMI (2.27%), geographic location (west, -13.82%),  
12 education of household head (primary school, -7.25%; middle  
13 school, 4.72%; high school and above, 28.54%), and self-assessed  
14 health status of household head (poor, 11.91%).

15

#### 16 **4. Discussion:**

17 By analyzing the national representative cross-sectional data  
18 of two waves from the CFPS in 2012 and 2016, this study  
19 estimates the extent of CHE for urban and rural households with

1 NCD patients, as well as the differences in the degree of CHE  
2 between the two groups.

3 Here, we found that the CHE incidence of households with  
4 NCD patients in urban and rural areas were 19.88% and 26.02%,  
5 respectively, which are much higher than the results of another  
6 study on the overall proportion of households incurring CHE in  
7 China (urban households: 13.06%; rural households: 17.70%)  
8 [17]. It indicates that the risk tolerance of households with NCD  
9 patients to OOP medical expenditure is lower than the average  
10 level of Chinese households. Our results also showed that the  
11 households with NCD patients had higher incidence and intensity  
12 of CHE in rural areas than in urban areas, demonstrating that rural  
13 households with NCD patients have higher risk of incurring CHE  
14 and heavier economic burden of diseases.

15 Using regression analysis to examine the relevant influencing  
16 factors for CHE incidence and intensity in 2012 and 2016, this  
17 research identified several key determinants reported in prior  
18 studies (e.g., economic status, household size, having elderly  
19 members, education of household head, receiving inpatient  
20 services in the last 12 months) [10, 22, 23, 37]. Specifically, higher  
21 annual household income per capita, larger household size and

1 higher education level of household head protected against CHE in  
2 urban and rural households with NCD patients. The geographic  
3 location of the west area reduced the risk of incurring CHE and  
4 financial burden of diseases in rural households with NCD patients.  
5 A potential explanation is that rural households with NCD patients  
6 in the western China forgo their needed health services due to the  
7 low income [38]. Conversely, households with elderly members  
8 and poor self-assessed health status of household head had higher  
9 risk of incurring CHE and heavier economic burden of diseases.

10 Basic medical insurance did not significantly reduce the  
11 incidence and intensity of CHE in both two groups, which is  
12 consistent with some existing literature [11, 22, 39-41]. The weak  
13 effect of basic medical insurance in reducing the incidence and  
14 intensity of CHE could be attributed to the relatively lower level of  
15 scope and actual reimbursement rate, as well as the heavy  
16 economic burden of NCDs [23]. It implies that under the premise  
17 of universal medical insurance in China, the reimbursement rate  
18 and benefit package of basic medical insurance for NCDs should be  
19 further improved to alleviate the economic burden of NCDs.

20 As the supplementary form of basic medical insurance, the  
21 coverage of SMI did not efficiently decrease the risk of incurring

1 CHE and alleviate financial burden of diseases. Given that SMI is  
2 characterized by high reimbursement rate and voluntary  
3 participation [42, 43], one plausible reason for the weak  
4 performance of SMI is low coverage rate. The coverage rate of SMI  
5 in urban households with NCD patients increased from 2.74% in  
6 2012 to 5.80% in 2016, while the coverage rate of SMI in rural  
7 households with NCD patients increased from 1.44% in 2012 to  
8 2.93% in 2016, indicating that a large number of households in  
9 China are not covered by SMI (Table 2).

10 From 2012 to 2016, the reduction of the unexplained  
11 disparity offset the increase of the explained disparity, resulting in  
12 a slight decrease of the rural-urban differences in the incidence  
13 and intensity of CHE.

14 More importantly, this article identified major contributors to  
15 explain the urban-rural differences in CHE incidence and intensity  
16 among households with NCD patients. Specifically, economic  
17 status made the largest positive contribution to the urban-rural  
18 differences. In addition, from 2012 to 2016, the disparity  
19 explained by economic status gradually increased, which can be  
20 attributed to the increase in the income gap between urban and  
21 rural households with NCD patients. Similarly, the education

1 attainment and self-assessed health status of household head also  
2 explained the disparity. Therefore, any intervention aimed at  
3 decreasing this disparity may be effective if they focus on the  
4 observable characteristics mentioned above.

5 Our research also found that SMI did not significantly affect  
6 the rural-urban differences in CHE incidence, but it was still a  
7 variable which was worthy of attention. The contribution of SMI to  
8 the rural-urban differences in CHE rose in 2016 compared with  
9 2012. The main reason for this result is the increase of urban-rural  
10 gap in coverage rate of SMI. The data from the present study  
11 suggested that the urban-rural disparity in coverage rate of SMI  
12 among households with NCD patients increased from 1.3% in  
13 2012 to 2.87% in 2016. Given the above issues, policy efforts  
14 should focus on improving overall coverage rate of SMI and  
15 reducing the urban-rural disparity in coverage rate of SMI.

16 In addition, the observed characteristics such as household  
17 size and geographic location of the west area had an opposite  
18 effect in explaining the urban-rural differences. If the urban-rural  
19 disparity is reduced in terms of above characteristics, the urban-  
20 rural differences in CHE incidence and intensity will be wilder.

1           The study is not without its limitations. First, various  
2           characteristics (e.g., the levels of medical institution, actual  
3           reimbursement rate of medical insurance, distance to the nearest  
4           medical institution) can significantly affect CHE in the reports of  
5           other scholars [22, 23, 44]. The absence of these variables in the  
6           data set leads to some unexplained urban-rural differences in  
7           incidence and intensity of CHE. Second, the present research uses  
8           a conservative method to estimate the OOP medical expenditure,  
9           resulting in indirect expenditure (e.g., transportation, food,  
10          consumption, lost productivity due to illness) not being included  
11          [10, 29]. Therefore, we underestimated the CHE incidence and  
12          intensity to a certain extent. Third, since this study involves self-  
13          reported information about health status of household head, the  
14          possibility of reporting errors cannot be ruled out.

## 15   **5. Conclusion:**

16          In conclusion, the present study suggested that rural  
17          households with NCD patients had higher CHE incidence and  
18          intensity than urban ones, and the rural-urban differences  
19          gradually decreased from 2012 to 2016. By using the methods of  
20          Fairlie nonlinear decomposition and Blinder-Oaxaca

1 decomposition, this research found that the annual household  
2 income per capita, education of household head, self-assessed  
3 health status of household head and SMI explained the rural-  
4 urban differences in CHE. Therefore, relevant policy interventions  
5 should give priority to decreasing the urban-rural disparity in  
6 observable characteristics mentioned above.

## 7 **Acknowledgments**

8 The authors sincerely thank Ju Sun and Qiang Yao for their  
9 helpful suggestions and valuable comments.

## 10 **Funding**

11 This study is supported by the National Social Science  
12 Foundation of China (Grant number: 15BSH043). The funders had no  
13 role in the design of this study, or data collection, analysis, and  
14 preparing the manuscript.

## 15 **Availability of data and materials**

16 Data and materials used during the current study are publicly  
17 available on the CFPS official website (see link:  
18 [https://opendata.pku.edu.cn/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.18170/DVN/4](https://opendata.pku.edu.cn/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.18170/DVN/45LCSO&version=31.0)  
19 [5LCSO&version=31.0](https://opendata.pku.edu.cn/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.18170/DVN/45LCSO&version=31.0)).

1 **Authors' Contributions**

2 Xian-zhi Fu formulated the primary framework of the study. Qi-  
3 wei Sun and Fei Xu conducted data analysis. Jun-jian He and Chang-  
4 qing Sun interpreted the results. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

5 **Authors' information**

6 Xian-zhi Fu, School of Political Science and Public Administration,  
7 Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, Hubei, China.

8 Qi-wei Sun, Provincial Higher People's Court, Harbin 150000,  
9 Heilongjiang, China.

10 Chang-qing Sun, Department of Social Medicine and Health  
11 Management, College of Public Health, Zhengzhou University,  
12 Zhengzhou 450001, Henan, China.

13 Fei Xu, Department of Social Medicine and Health Management,  
14 College of Public Health, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou 450001,  
15 Henan, China.

16 Jun-jian He, Department of Social Medicine and Health  
17 Management, College of Public Health, Zhengzhou University,  
18 Zhengzhou 450001, Henan, China.

19 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

1           The study is conducted in accordance with the ethical standards  
2 of the institutional and national research committees and with the  
3 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its subsequent revisions or similar  
4 ethical standards. Each volunteer participant obtained a written  
5 informed consent based on inclusion criteria.

## 6 **Consent for publication**

7           The authors give consent for publication of this paper in Health  
8 Research Policy and Systems.

## 9 **Competing interests**

10          The authors declare that there are no competing interests.

## 11 **References**

- 12 1. Evans DB, Etienne C. Health systems financing and the path to universal  
13 coverage. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2010; 88:402.
- 14 2. Hogan DR, Stevens GA, Hosseinpoor AR, Boerma T. Monitoring universal  
15 health coverage within the Sustainable Development Goals: development and  
16 baseline data for an index of essential health services. *Lancet Glob Health.*  
17 2018; 6:e152-e168.
- 18 3. World Health Organization-World Bank. Global Monitoring Report 2017:  
19 Tracking universal health coverage; 2019.  
20 [http://www.emro.who.int/fr/media/advocacy-materials/who-world-bank-](http://www.emro.who.int/fr/media/advocacy-materials/who-world-bank-tracking-universal-health-coverage-2017-global-monitoring-report.html)  
21 [tracking-universal-health-coverage-2017-global-monitoring-report.html](http://www.emro.who.int/fr/media/advocacy-materials/who-world-bank-tracking-universal-health-coverage-2017-global-monitoring-report.html)
- 22 4. Wang L, Kong L, Wu F, Bai Y, Burton R. Preventing Chronic Diseases in China.  
23 *Lancet.* 2005; 366:1821-1824.
- 24 5. The National Health and Family Planning Commission of China. The progress  
25 of disease prevention in China (in Chinese). *Capital Journal of Public Health.*  
26 2015; 9(3):97-101.
- 27 6. Reinhardt U E , Cheng T M. The world health report 2000 -- Health systems:  
28 improving performance. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization.* 2000;  
29 78(8):1064.

- 1 7. Guo Y, Shibuya K, Cheng G, Rao K, Lee L, Tang S. Tracking China's health  
2 reform. *Lancet*. 2010; 375:1056-1058.
- 3 8. Yip WCM, Hsiao WC, Chen W, Hu SL, Ma J, Maynard A. Early appraisal of  
4 China's huge and complex health-care reforms. *Lancet*. 2012; 379:833-842.
- 5 9. Xu Y, Ma J, Wu N, Fan X, Zhang T, Zhou Z, Gao J, Ren J, Chen G.  
6 Catastrophic health expenditure in households with chronic disease patients:  
7 A pre-post comparison of the New Health Care Reform in Shaanxi Province,  
8 China. *PLoS One*. 2018; 13:e0194539.
- 9 10. Si YF, Zhou ZL, Su M, Wang X, Lan X, Wang D, Gong SQ, Xiao X, Shen C, Ren  
10 YL, et al. Decomposing inequality in catastrophic health expenditure for self-  
11 reported hypertension household in Urban Shaanxi, China from 2008 to 2013:  
12 two waves' cross-sectional study. *Bmj Open*. 2019; 9:9.
- 13 11. Sun J, Lyu SJ. The effect of medical insurance on catastrophic health  
14 expenditure: evidence from China. *Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation*.  
15 2020; 18:11.
- 16 12. Hui-ping Wang, Zeng-tao Wang, Peng-cheng Ma. Situation analysis and  
17 thinking about poverty caused by illness in rural areas: Based on research  
18 data of 1214 families whose poverty is caused by illness in 9 Provinces in  
19 West China (in Chinese). *Economist*. 2016; (10):71-81.
- 20 13. Fu XZ, Wang LK, Sun CQ, Wang DD, He JJ, Tang QX, Zhou QY. Inequity in  
21 inpatient services utilization: a longitudinal comparative analysis of middle-  
22 aged and elderly patients with the chronic non-communicable diseases in  
23 China. *International Journal for Equity in Health*. 2020; 19:17.
- 24 14. Zhang XY, Xu QQ, Guo XL, Jing ZY, Sun L, Li JJ, Zhou CC. Catastrophic health  
25 expenditure: a comparative study between hypertensive patients with and  
26 without complication in rural Shandong, China. *Bmc Public Health*. 2020;  
27 20:13.
- 28 15. Lee M, Yoon K. Catastrophic Health Expenditures and Its Inequality in  
29 Households with Cancer Patients: A Panel Study. *Processes*. 2019; 7:12.
- 30 16. Gwatidzo SD, Williams JS. Diabetes mellitus medication use and catastrophic  
31 healthcare expenditure among adults aged 50+years in China and India:  
32 results from the WHO study on global AGEing and adult health (SAGE). *Bmc*  
33 *Geriatrics*. 2017; 17:15.
- 34 17. Zhao Y, Oldenburg B, Mahal A, Lin Y, Tang S, Liu X. Trends and socio-  
35 economic disparities in catastrophic health expenditure and health  
36 impoverishment in China: 2010 to 2016. *Tropical Medicine & International*  
37 *Health*. 2020; 25:236-247.
- 38 18. Xie B, Huo MH, Wang ZQ, Chen YJ, Fu R, Liu MN, Meng Q. Impact of the New  
39 Cooperative Medical Scheme on the trend of catastrophic health expenditure  
40 in Chinese rural households: results from nationally representative surveys  
41 from 2003 to 2013. *Bmj Open*. 2018; 8:9.
- 42 19. Ma XC, Wang ZY, Liu XY. Progress on Catastrophic Health Expenditure in  
43 China: Evidence from China Family Panel Studies (CFPS) 2010 to 2016.  
44 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2019;  
45 16:11.
- 46 20. O'Donnell O, Doorslaer E, Wagstaff A, Lindelow M. Analyzing Health Equity  
47 Using Household Survey Data: A Guide to Techniques and Their  
48 Implementation. 2008.
- 49 21. Wagstaff A, Lindelow M. Can insurance increase financial risk? The curious  
50 case of health insurance in China. *J Health Econ*. 2008; 27:990-1005.

- 1 22. Wang ZH, Li XJ, Chen MS. Catastrophic health expenditures and its inequality  
2 in elderly households with chronic disease patients in China. *International*  
3 *Journal for Equity in Health*. 2015; 14:11.
- 4 23. Si Y, Zhou Z, Su M, Ma M, Xu Y, Heitner J. Catastrophic healthcare  
5 expenditure and its inequality for households with hypertension: evidence  
6 from the rural areas of Shaanxi Province in China. *International journal for*  
7 *equity in health*. 2017; 16:27-27.
- 8 24. Xu K, Evans DB, Kawabata K, Zeramdini R, Klavus J, Murray CJ. Household  
9 catastrophic health expenditure: a multicountry analysis. *Lancet*. 2003;  
10 362:111-117.
- 11 25. Van Minh H, Kim Phuong NT, Saksena P, James CD, Xu K. Financial burden of  
12 household out-of pocket health expenditure in Viet Nam: findings from the  
13 National Living Standard Survey 2002-2010. *Soc Sci Med*. 2013; 96:258-263.
- 14 26. Ahmadnezhad E, Murphy A, Alvandi R, Abdi Z. The impact of health reform in  
15 Iran on catastrophic health expenditures: Equity and policy implications. *Int J*  
16 *Health Plann Manage*. 2019.
- 17 27. Kavosi Z, Rashidian A, Pourreza A, Majdzadeh R, Pourmalek F, Hosseinpour A,  
18 Mohammad K. Inequality in household catastrophic healthcare expenditure in  
19 a low-income society of Iran. *Health policy and planning*. 2012; 27:613-623.
- 20 28. Arsenijevic J, Pavlova M, Rechel B, Groot W. Catastrophic Health Care  
21 Expenditure among Older People with Chronic Diseases in 15 European  
22 Countries. *PloS one*. 2016; 11:e0157765.
- 23 29. Lee JE, Shin HI, Do YK, Yang EJ. Catastrophic Health Expenditures for  
24 Households with Disabled Members: Evidence from the Korean Health Panel.  
25 *Journal of Korean Medical Science*. 2016; 31:336-344.
- 26 30. Blinder AS. WAGE DISCRIMINATION - REDUCED FORM AND STRUCTURAL  
27 ESTIMATES. *Journal of Human Resources*. 1973; 8:436-455.
- 28 31. Oaxaca R. Male-Female Wage Differentials in Urban Labor Markets.  
29 *International Economic Review*. 1973; 14:693-709.
- 30 32. Fairlie RW. The absence of the African-American owned business: An analysis  
31 of the dynamics of self-employment. *Journal of Labor Economics*. 1999;  
32 17:80-108.
- 33 33. Fairlie R. An Extension of the Blinder-Oaxaca Decomposition Technique to  
34 Logit and Probit Models. *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement*. 2005;  
35 30:305-316.
- 36 34. Mehta H, Rajan S, Aparasu R, Johnson M. Application of the nonlinear  
37 Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition to study racial/ethnic disparities in antiobesity  
38 medication use in the United States. *Research in social & administrative*  
39 *pharmacy*. 2012; 9.
- 40 35. Jann B. A STATA implementation of the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition. *The*  
41 *Stata Journal*. 2008; 8.
- 42 36. Oaxaca R, Ransom M. On Discrimination and the Decomposition of Wage  
43 Differentials. *Journal of Econometrics*. 1994; 61:5-21.
- 44 37. Xu Y, Gao J, Zhou Z, Xue Q, Yang J, Luo H, Li Y, Lai S, Chen G. Measurement  
45 and explanation of socioeconomic inequality in catastrophic health care  
46 expenditure: Evidence from the rural areas of Shaanxi Province. *BMC health*  
47 *services research*. 2015; 15:256.
- 48 38. Li Y, Wu Q, Liu C, Kang Z, Xie X, Yin H, Jiao M, Liu G, Hao Y, Ning N.  
49 Catastrophic Health Expenditure and Rural Household Impoverishment in  
50 China: What Role Does the New Cooperative Health Insurance Scheme Play?  
51 *PloS one*. 2014; 9:e93253.

- 1 39. Jiang CH, Ma JD, Zhang X, Luo WJ. Measuring financial protection for health  
2 in families with chronic conditions in Rural China. *Bmc Public Health*. 2012;  
3 12:7.
- 4 40. Liu H, Zhao Z. Impact of China's Urban Resident Basic Medical Insurance on  
5 Health Care Utilization and Expenditure. 2012.
- 6 41. Lei X, Lin W. The New Cooperative Medical Scheme in rural China: does more  
7 coverage mean more service and better health? *Health economics*. 2009; 18  
8 Suppl 2:S25-46.
- 9 42. Dong K. Medical Insurance System Evolution in China. *China Economic*  
10 *Review*. 2009; 20:591-597.
- 11 43. Li AQ, Shi YL, Yang X, Wang ZH. Effect of Critical Illness Insurance on  
12 Household Catastrophic Health Expenditure: The Latest Evidence from the  
13 National Health Service Survey in China. *International Journal of*  
14 *Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2019; 16:17.
- 15 44. Guo N, Iversen T, Lu MS, Wang J, Shi LW. Does the new cooperative medical  
16 scheme reduce inequality in catastrophic health expenditure in rural China?  
17 *Bmc Health Services Research*. 2016; 16:11.

18