

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_127884
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of 3 Financial Models in the Health System: (Pay-for-performance, Results-Based-Budgeting, Capitation)
Type of the Article	Review Article

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>		
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>The topic is feasible and rightly couch but I will suggest a little adjustment to:</b> "An Analysis of 3 Financial Models in the Health System: (Pay-for-performance, Results-Based-Budgeting, Capitation)"	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p><b>Yes the article's abstract is concise but lack some details that can improve the quality of the abstract.</b>  <b>My Recommendations:</b>          1. Incorporate a brief overview of the three model presented for the study, instead of just listing them on the abstract. This will give a reader a one-stand understanding of what these models are, their relationship and function within the context of the article in view.          2. Provide a brief mention of the methodology and the criteria for selecting these three models provided and state the scope of the study and of the literatures reviewed. This will give the article a more scientific view and robust understanding of why these three models were selected forms other models and also afford readers with the scope threshold for the article.          3. The keyword section should be refined to enhance discoverability and academic alignment.</p>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p><b>My reasons:</b>          1. Lack of Sound research design          2. No defined population for the article          3. No data or method of data collection for the study          4. Lacks method of Data Analysis          5. No result, on what basis was the recommendation done?          These are among others key life that makes an article scientific and all are lacked within the context of the study.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p><b>It is a mix situation:</b>  <b>My Position:</b>          1. The reference has a mixture of fairly recent references          2. Has too many old citations and references.  <b>My Recommendation:</b>          Improve the literatures to include citations no later than 10 year i.e, 2014 to 2024. This will make the article more recent and contemporary.</p>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes. And I commend the authors efforts to this reality.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>The article provided deep insigh and valuable examination of various healthcare financial model but requires:</b>          1. Requires a concise objectives          2. Theories to anchor or underpin the article          3. Requires proper methodological and analytical organization to archive its full potentials.          4. The authors voice is absent from the introduction section. The authors voice need to be heard and articulated in the introduction, citations are mainly supposed to support and position concretising and not to premise the introductory part of the introduction          5. The introduction should start with "Global view of of the article, the continental view, the national view and the scope view of the study.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</p>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Clifmanic Godwin Olofu</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Phoenix University Agwada, Nigeria</b></p>