

Review Form2

Book Name:	Business, Management and Economics: Research Progress
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2237
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding the Dynamics Interaction within Indonesia Healthcare Competition
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1. Health service issues in Indonesia are not evenly distributed, this is important to be studied to support the welfare of the community as stated in the SDGs 2. The implementation of government regulatory policies that require the use of JKN/BPJS in health programs is still not optimal in its implementation 3. The community, especially the lower middle class, has not been given options that provide the best value 4. The services provided in treatment are still winding and go through a fairly strict bureaucracy that does not make it easy 5. Scientific research is needed to be more accurate and valid in proposing improvements to health program policies to regulators	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title actually fits the article, it's just not commercial enough to read, the suggested title is: <i>how to boosts superior health services in Indonesia</i>	
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.	The word : <i>to understand</i> is replaced with <i>toanalyze or to investigate</i> Add respondent information, and more specific research methods	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Quite appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1. In scientific studies with a qualitative descriptive approach, it can be accepted and is strong enough through the background of the problems of the Indonesian health industry and the right respondents, and using the five forces porter tool to determine the attractiveness of the industry in competition. 2. The output in qualitative research is to find a new concept or new problem formulation so that it can be continued with a more scientific research method through verification and descriptive statistical tests	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References need to be added with the latest year to be more accurate and valid, as there are changes in policies including: - Sources of current problem phenomena in Indonesia - Current policy references - Previous research references from around 5 years ago Additional reference suggestions:	

Review Form2

	Indonesian Healthcare Industry Competition: Challenges and KPPU Supervision “Shields” Muhammad Alfarizi1 muhammad.alfarizi@binus.ac.id Zela Zalika2 042387302@ecampus.ut.ac.id	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	By using the Grammarly Premium application, there are still around 227 words that need to be corrected.	
Optional/General comments	In general, for qualitative journal perspectives it is acceptable, but for book chapter purposes, it can be added, among others; survey/interview results with respondents, processing of five forces porter data using quantitative calculations, and results of the health industry attractiveness assessment. So that it can be explored more widely and more comprehensive managerial implications to be proposed to related stakeholders.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment(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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nurul Hermina
Department, University & Country	Widyatama University Bandung, Indonesia