

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57166

Title: Financing Pressure, Demographic Change, and the Public–Private Mix in Five Health Systems Across Continents: A Comparative Secondary Policy Analysis,

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revisionx.....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		x		
Techn. Quality		x		
Clarity		x		
Significance		x		

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 142

Detailed Reviewer's Report

General Overview

The manuscript presents a comparative policy analysis of five health systems—Canada, Brazil, Japan, Germany, and South Africa—focusing on financing pressure, demographic transitions, and the public–private mix. The study addresses a highly relevant global health policy issue and adopts a structured analytical framework using internationally recognized data sources such as OECD, World Bank, and PAHO.

The manuscript is well-written, logically structured, and demonstrates a clear understanding of health system heterogeneity across different economic and demographic contexts. The inclusion of comparative tables and descriptive figures (as seen on pages 3–5) strengthens the clarity and interpretability of the analysis.

However, while the manuscript is conceptually strong, it remains largely descriptive and would benefit from further methodological rigor, deeper engagement with recent literature, and stronger analytical integration of findings.

Comments

1. Methodological Clarity and Rigor

The study employs a secondary policy-analysis design; however, the methodological framework requires further elaboration. The criteria for selecting the five countries are described narratively but lack formal justification. Additionally, there is no clear explanation of how indicators were harmonized across datasets with different reference years. Strengthening methodological transparency would improve reproducibility and credibility.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

2. **Descriptive Nature of Analysis**

The manuscript relies heavily on descriptive comparisons without incorporating quantitative or statistical validation. While the figures (pages 4–5) effectively visualize trends in health expenditure and ageing populations, the absence of even basic analytical techniques (e.g., correlation or comparative indices) limits the depth of inference.

3. **Literature Integration**

The introduction and discussion sections would benefit from a more comprehensive and up-to-date literature review. Recent studies (within the last 5 years) on health financing, universal health coverage, and demographic transitions should be incorporated to better position the study within existing scholarship.

4. **Conceptual Framework**

Although the manuscript implicitly follows a structured analytical logic, an explicit conceptual or theoretical framework is not presented. Including a diagram or model illustrating the interaction between financing pressure, demographic change, and system capacity would enhance clarity.

5. **Policy Implications**

The discussion provides useful comparative insights; however, policy implications remain somewhat general. More specific, actionable recommendations tailored to each country context would strengthen the practical relevance of the study.

The manuscript has strong conceptual and policy relevance, but requires significant improvements in methodological rigor, analytical depth, and literature integration before it can be considered for publication.