

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 after minor revision.....

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 198

Detailed Reviewer's Report

This manuscript presents a comparative policy analysis of five health systems across continents, focusing on financing pressure, demographic change, and public–private mix. The topic is highly relevant and well-framed, and the manuscript is structured, data-supported, and clearly written. However, it remains largely descriptive and interpretive, with limited analytical depth or methodological rigor.

Major Comments

1. Originality

The comparative framing of “financing pressure as a multidimensional concept” is conceptually strong. However, the study mainly synthesizes existing data without generating new analytical or empirical insights.

2. Technical Quality

The design is appropriate for policy analysis, but:

- No formal comparative methodology (e.g., framework validation, weighting, or scoring)
- No statistical or causal analysis
- Cross-country comparisons rely on non-synchronized data

REVIEWER'S REPORT

3. Methodology

The five analytical dimensions are clearly defined (page 2–3) , and the operationalization table improves transparency (Appendix A, page 10) . However:

- Selection of countries lacks strong justification criteria
- No systematic approach to indicator harmonization
- Comparability limitations are acknowledged but not resolved

4. Results & Evidence

Data presentation is a strong point:

- Clear comparative table (Table 1, page 3)
- Effective visualization of spending and ageing (Figures 1–3, pages 3–5)
- Well-structured pressure profiles (Table 2, page 5)

However:

- Results remain descriptive
- No deeper comparative metrics or synthesis beyond narrative interpretation

5. Discussion

The cross-case discussion is insightful and logically structured. It clearly differentiates types of financing pressure across systems. However, it does not significantly advance theory or provide strong policy innovation.

6. Clarity and Writing

Excellent:

- Clear, academic tone
- Strong organization
- Effective use of tables and figures

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

7. References

High-quality and appropriate:

- Strong reliance on OECD, World Bank, and official sources
- Recent and relevant citations

Minor Comments

- Strengthen justification for country selection
- Add a conceptual model/diagram
- Reduce repetition in narrative sections
- Clarify limits of cross-country comparability more explicitly