



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                                            |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <b><u>British Journal of Economics, Management &amp; Trade</u></b>                                         |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>2014_BJEMT_13864</b>                                                                                    |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>EVALUATING PERFORMANCE OF CHEST DISEASES DEPARTMENTS USING HOSPITAL EFFICIENCY INDICATORS IN TURKEY</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>                                                                           |

**General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

That is the case. The manuscript lacks novelty, but is technically honest and didactical. I believe it would not be accepted if this review policy was not stated.



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|                                            | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | <p>Although relevant, didactic and practical, there are some limitations intrinsic to the methodology that should be presented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- First, as proposed by the authors, the PLM method does not approach efficiency in the sense that the production or targets are analysed according to the amount of resources used. PLM seems to consider effectiveness rather than efficiency.</li> <li>- Second, in order to compare chest disease departments, some risk-adjustments techniques should be considered, as the use DRG or Charlson Index for case-mix. For instance, university, public and hospitals with higher number of beds may be a reference for more severe patients, with a number of co-morbidities. In this case, it would not be fair to consider their ineffectiveness in comparison with other units.</li> </ul> <p>Even if there is not data enough to cope with the method's improvement, the limitations should be discussed.</p> <p>In fact, given the chronic behaviour of the most common chest diseases that lead to medical care, a zone IV pattern should be expected at first. This fact does not diminish the merit of the method as it distinguishes different behaviours even inside the same zone.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PLM can be used both for effectiveness and efficiency. Even though they are not the same, there is not a big gap between two concepts.</li> </ul> <p>-This study only uses PLM and its required dimensions. Yes, there are more inputs or other variables however, this is PLM. Also, as explained in the study's method, similar qualified (purposeful sampling) hospitals has been chosen for the same concerns trying to attempt the minimize the differences among hospitals as referee indicated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It has been explained that the 3 cities and the departments with available data are the limitations. There is no claim to expand my results in the study. I agree its very limited and obtaining those data was not easy also. If you check the literature, there is no study on this subject with very specific and solid data.</li> <li>- I am hoping there is no need to expect anymore in the given sampling.</li> </ul> |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      | As efficiency analysis was emphasized in the Introduction section, there are important references concerning the                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Yes, it has been missed. Thank you for the input. Hollingsworth's review was quite helpful. His                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                         | methodological approaches used to deal with that dimension of quality of care. That is the case of Hollingsworth's review (Health Economics, 2008) and Ozcan's et al considerations for university hospitals' performance measurement (Annals of Operations Research, 2010). | study was broad comparing to this study. Some of his comments has been also used in the revised conclusion section.<br>I also missed Ozcan's et al study related o Brazil. There are similar references but its because my sampling does not include 'teaching hospitals' I passed it. |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments | It would be interesting to confront efficiency and effectiveness approaches as differing dimensions of quality of care.                                                                                                                                                      | Agreed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |