

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Social Determinants of Health: Legal Frameworks for Addressing Inequities

Mehmet Çevik^{1*}, Hulya Toker¹¹ Department of Social Sciences, Ankara University, Türkiye




* Corresponding author email address: mehmetcevik@asbu.edu.tr

Received: 2022-05-11

Revised: 2022-05-30

Accepted: 2022-06-09

Published: 2022-07-01

EDITOR:Yusuf MohamedDepartment of Architecture and City Design, King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia
yusufmohamed@kfupm.edu.sa**REVIEWER 1:**Fatimah SahdanFaculty of Social and Political Sciences (FISIP) Diponegoro University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
fatimahsahdan@rocketmail.com**REVIEWER 2:**Muhammad Abdul RahmanDepartment of Humanities, Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
muhammadrahman@ntu.edu.sg**Round 1***1.1. Reviewer 1*

Reviewer:

The literature review is thorough, covering a range of interventions and their impacts. It would be beneficial to include a more detailed discussion on the limitations of current studies and potential biases within the reviewed literature to provide a balanced view.

The methodology section is concise, yet it lacks specificity regarding the criteria for selecting case studies and empirical studies. Expanding on how these selections were made, including any exclusion criteria, would strengthen the validity of the review.

There are a few typographical errors and inconsistencies in citation formatting throughout the document. A careful proofreading and adherence to the journal's style guide are recommended to maintain professionalism and readability.

The conclusion effectively summarizes the findings but could be strengthened by explicitly linking back to the key research questions introduced at the beginning. Highlighting the implications of this study for future legal reforms and health policy development would provide a more impactful ending.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paper is well-structured, presenting a clear argument supported by empirical evidence. However, the transitions between sections could be smoother to enhance the readability. I recommend adding brief summaries at the end of each section to guide the reader through the logical progression of the paper.

The manuscript does an excellent job of describing and critiquing various legal frameworks. Incorporating a discussion on emerging legal theories or models not yet applied in practice could offer innovative perspectives on addressing SDH.

While the manuscript concludes with practical recommendations for policy and practice, it could also propose specific areas for future academic research, particularly in exploring interdisciplinary approaches that combine legal studies with other fields like economics or sociology.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.