



Andi Ahmad Yani <aayani@unhas.ac.id>

[PPA]

2 messages

Aleksandras Patapas <patapas@mruni.eu>

Wed, Aug 18, 2021 at 3:22 PM

To: Dr Gita Susanti <gitasusanti65@gmail.com>

Cc: Andi Ahmad Yani <aayani@unhas.ac.id>, Muhammad Irvan Nur Iva <m.irvan.nuriva@gmail.com>, Andi Rahmat Hidayat <andirahmatfisip@gmail.com>

Dear Author!

Please find the reviews attached. Please make the corrections to the article accordingly. Upload the corrected version to the OJS (not as a new submission!).

The maximum length of the acceptable article can be 12 pages in Times New Roman with 1.5 spaces between the lines. Please shorten your article accordingly.

Please provide info about the author at the end of the article using our journal standard:

Rafał Prof., Adjunct in Department of Macroeconomics Institute of Economics at the Faculty of Economics and Nagaj, Assoc Management University of Szczecin, Poland.
E-mail: wasik@wneiz.pl

Brigita Žuromskaitė, Assoc. Prof., Institute of Management at Faculty of Politics and Management Mykolas Romeris University in Vilnius, Lithuania.
E-mail: brigita@wp.eu

Please use Chicago style for references, this is the new requirement: (Rostkowski 2016, 6-7)
Please upload updated article to the OJS (not as a new submission).
The numbered conclusions are the strict requirement of the format.
If you would have any questions please do not hesitate to ask me.

Best regards,
Executive Editor

Reviewer A:

General recommendation:
to be accepted with minor corrections, without further review

Type of article:
case study

Is the article appropriate to the subject matter of the journal?:
appropriate

Article evaluation• The front matter of the article (summary, introduction):

1. Presentation of the issues and selected objectives:
Adequate
2. Evaluation of existing literature on the issue:
Questionable
3. Selected methodology for the analysis of the issue:
Appropriate
4. Is the issue current?:
Yes
5. Is the issue relevant?:
Yes

Comments: :

The topic is current and relevant, presented objectives are solid. Appropriate methods are chosen to achieve the set objectives. Still the literature analysis seems a bit poor. It mainly consists of the review of official reports, while disclosing the views of scholars on key aspects of the topic would be very useful and benefit.

2. The contents of the article:

1. Is the title appropriate to the contents?:
Yes
2. Should the text be abridged or parts of it edited out?:
No
3. Are included graphs and tables necessary, appropriate and informative?:
Yes
4. Are all references necessary and are they precise?:
Yes
5. Are the keywords and the summary informative?:
Questionable
6. Is the author's literary style satisfactory?:
Yes

Comments: :

Tables are informative, and the decision to highlight key problems in them makes sense. The introduction is too long comparing to the other parts of the paper in my personal opinion. The summary in Lithuanian should be added. Keyword "Indonesia" is not necessary, because it is known from the title.

3. The concluding text:

1. How do the conclusions reflect the title and objectives of the article, the presented facts and findings?:
Questionable
2. References and bibliography:
Questionable

Comments: :

The conclusions reflects the title. However, they basically only identify problems of the health insurance system in Indonesia. No highlighted

measures or proposals to solve these problems and improve the system are provided. They could be hypothetical, normative, but would still add weight to the conclusions of the paper.

4. Presentation of research findings:

1. Depth of analysis:

Questionable

2. Appropriate use of selected methodology:

Questionable

3. Are the main arguments sound?:

Questionable

4. Are the conclusions and recommendations clear and concise?:

Questionable

Comments: :

Used research methods look capable. While the usage of these methods are not fully disclosed in the text. For this reason some readers may have serious doubts about the validity of the study. The presentation of the application of the methods could take up more space instead of a slightly too long introduction.

Some might say that naming problems is a sufficient conclusion for the case study, but in my opinion more specific recommendations would give more solidity for the work.

In your opinion, what are the main strengths and weaknesses of this article?:

A wide range of research methods are used to reveal the topic, which allows the problematic aspects to be examined comprehensively.

More precise presentation of scientific methods use is desirable.

Greater attention should be paid to the compliance of the article with the requirements of the journal. There is not even named the author of the article.

Other comments: :

A lot of work has been put into and the paper is significant. Critical remarks presented in this review is not criticism of the work already done. I believe that these remarks will help to highlight some minor aspects that in my personal opinion need to be corrected and will help for the future researches.

Reviewer B:

General recommendation:

to be accepted after applying indicated changes

Type of article:

case study

Is the article appropriate to the subject matter of the journal?:

appropriate

Article evaluation• The front matter of the article (summary, introduction):

1. Presentation of the issues and selected objectives:

Adequate

2. Evaluation of existing literature on the issue:

Adequate

3. Selected methodology for the analysis of the issue:

Questionable

4. Is the issue current?:

Yes

5. Is the issue relevant?:

Yes

Comments: :

The methodology is not clear, so it is difficult to assess its reliability.

2. The contents of the article:

1. Is the title appropriate to the contents?:

Yes

2. Should the text be abridged or parts of it edited out?:

Yes

3. Are included graphs and tables necessary, appropriate and informative?:

Yes

4. Are all references necessary and are they precise?:

Yes

5. Are the keywords and the summary informative?:

Yes

6. Is the author's literary style satisfactory?:

Yes

Comments: :

The discussion required greater interpretation of the literature and demonstrating what is the theoretical contribution.

3. The concluding text:

1. How do the conclusions reflect the title and objectives of the article, the presented facts and findings?:

Adequate

2. References and bibliography:

Adequate

Comments: :

-

4. Presentation of research findings:

1. Depth of analysis:

Needs editing

2. Appropriate use of selected methodology:

Needs editing

3. Are the main arguments sound?:

Needs editing

4. Are the conclusions and recommendations clear and concise?:

Yes

Comments :

The methodological part is unclear. You use several methods, but the research sample and the reasons for the choice are unclear too. The discussion required greater interpretation of the literature and demonstrating what is the theoretical contribution. The data and analyzes presented appropriately should be refined more in line with the benefits and practical value of the study.

In your opinion, what are the main strengths and weaknesses of this article?:

The main strengths: relevance and specificity of the research object
Main weaknesses: unclear methodological substantiation and interpretation of the discussion part.

Other comments :

-

Public policy and administration/Viešoji politika ir administravimas
<https://www3.mruni.eu/ojs/public-policy-and-administration>

Andi Yani <aayani@unhas.ac.id>

Thu, Aug 19, 2021 at 9:56 PM

To: Aleksandras Patapas <patapas@mruni.eu>

Cc: Dr Gita Susanti <gitasusanti65@gmail.com>, Muhammad Irvan Nur Iva <m.irvan.nuriva@gmail.com>, Andi Rahmat Hidayat <andirahmatfisip@gmail.com>

Dear Prof Aleksandras Patapas,

Thank you for your email and considering our manuscript.
We will revise based on Reviewers' suggestions and submit it via PPA's submission system.

Best regards,

Andi Ahmad Yani

*Department of Administrative Science
Hasanuddin University
Jl. Perintis Kemerdekaan KM 10 90245
Makassar - Indonesia*

[Quoted text hidden]



Universitas Hasanuddin

Andi Ahmad Yani <aayani@unhas.ac.id>

[PPA]

3 messages

Aleksandras Patapas <patapas@mruni.eu> Mon, Dec 6, 2021 at 12:02 PM
To: Dr Gita Susanti <gitasusanti65@gmail.com>
Cc: Andi Ahmad Yani <aayani@unhas.ac.id>, Muhammad Irvan Nur Iva <m.irvan.nuriva@gmail.com>, Andi Rahmat Hidayat <andirahmatfisip@gmail.com>

Dear author!

Have you got my previous letter? If there is no reaction from you to my previous letter within 2 weeks we will be forced to decline your submission and remove it from the system.

Best regards,
Alex

Public policy and administration/Viešoji politika ir administravimas
<https://www3.mruni.eu/ojs/public-policy-and-administration>

Andi Yani <aayani@unhas.ac.id> Tue, Dec 7, 2021 at 4:04 PM
To: Aleksandras Patapas <patapas@mruni.eu>
Cc: Dr Gita Susanti <gitasusanti65@gmail.com>, Muhammad Irvan Nur Iva <m.irvan.nuriva@gmail.com>, Andi Rahmat Hidayat <andirahmatfisip@gmail.com>

Dear Prof Aleksandras,

Thank you for your email and apologies for the late reply.
We did receive your previous letter and we are working on revising the article based on reviewers' comments. We will sent revised version as soon as possible (before two weeks as you requested)
Lastly, thank you for considering our article to be published in the PPA

Best regards,

On behalf all authors

Andi Ahmad Yani

*Senior Lecturer
Department of Administrative Science
Universitas Hasanuddin
Indonesia*

[Quoted text hidden]

Andi Yani <aayani@unhas.ac.id> Fri, Dec 17, 2021 at 2:50 PM
To: Aleksandras Patapas <patapas@mruni.eu>
Cc: Dr Gita Susanti <gitasusanti65@gmail.com>, Muhammad Irvan Nur Iva <m.irvan.nuriva@gmail.com>, Andi Rahmat Hidayat <andirahmatfisip@gmail.com>

Dear Prof Aleksandras,

I hope this email finds you well.
On behalf of Dr Gita Susanti as the first author, I would like to inform you that we have already uploaded a revised

version of our article at PPA website.
Herewith attached revised version for your reference.

Best regards,

Andi Ahmad Yani
Department of Administrative Science
Hasanuddin University
Indonesia

On Mon, Dec 6, 2021 at 12:02 PM Aleksandras Patapas <patapas@mruni.eu> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]



Universitas Hasanuddin

Andi Ahmad Yani <aayani@unhas.ac.id>

[PPA] Editor Decision

1 message

Aleksandras Patapas <patapas@mruni.eu>

Thu, Dec 8, 2022 at 4:20 PM

To: Gita Susanti <gitasusanti65@gmail.com>, Andi Ahmad Yani <aayani@unhas.ac.id>, Muhammad Irvan Nur Iva <m.irvan.nuriva@gmail.com>, Andi Rahmat Hidayat <andirahmatfisip@gmail.com>

Gita Susanti, Andi Ahmad Yani, Muhammad Irvan Nur Iva, Andi Rahmat Hidayat:

The editing of your submission, "Assesing National Health Insurance System: A Policy Implementation Study of Indonesia Health Insurance Policy," is complete. We are now sending it to production.

Submission URL: <https://ojs.mruni.eu/ojs/public-policy-and-administration/authorDashboard/submission/6388>

Public policy and
administration/Viešoji politika ir administravimas <https://www3.mruni.eu/ojs/public-policy-and-administration>