

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Influence of Political Lobbying on Healthcare Legislation: A Critical Examination

Mrinalini Puranik^{1*}, Pankaj Pankaj², Santosh Kumar³¹ National Health Mission, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, India² Knowledge Management Division, National Health Systems Resource Centre, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, India³ Executive Director, National Health Systems Resource Centre, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, India

* Corresponding author email address: MriPuranik@gmail.com

Received: 2022-05-22

Revised: 2022-06-10

Accepted: 2022-06-20

Published: 2022-07-01

EDITOR:

Pınar Reisoğlu

Faculty of Social Sciences, Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Rize, Turkey
pinarreisoglu@erdogan.edu.tr**REVIEWER 1:**

Shehzad Raj

School of Law, Universiti Geomatika Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
shehzadraj@geomatika.edu.my**REVIEWER 2:**

Jingjing Wang

Law School, Peking University (PKU), Peking, China
jingwang@vip.sina.com

Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Overall, the manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of the subject matter. However, there are sections where the argument could be presented more coherently. Specifically, the transition between the literature review and the presentation of empirical findings could be smoother. A brief summary at the end of the literature review section that outlines the forthcoming analysis would help in maintaining the flow of the narrative.

While the literature review is extensive, it primarily focuses on the financial aspects of lobbying and its strategic implications. Including additional theoretical perspectives, such as those related to the ethical considerations of lobbying in healthcare, would enrich the discussion. References to recent debates on the transparency and regulation of lobbying activities could provide a more holistic view of the subject matter.

The methodology section briefly describes the search strategy and criteria for inclusion and exclusion of studies but lacks detail on the analytical techniques used to synthesize the literature findings. Clarifying whether a meta-analysis, thematic analysis, or another method was employed would enhance the reader's understanding of how the conclusions were drawn.

The discussion on policy implications is insightful but would benefit from more concrete examples of how the findings could inform specific regulatory changes or policy interventions. Suggestions for how lawmakers and stakeholders might implement the recommendations would make this section more impactful.

The manuscript concludes with a call for further research but could be more specific about the areas that are ripe for investigation. Identifying particular gaps in the current understanding of lobbying's effects on healthcare outcomes or regulatory frameworks would guide future scholarly work.

A thorough check for typos and grammatical errors is recommended to enhance readability. Additionally, ensuring that all references are correctly formatted and up-to-date would reinforce the manuscript's academic rigor.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The presentation of empirical data and findings could be enhanced for better clarity. Incorporating visual aids such as charts or tables summarizing the main investments and lobbying efforts discussed in the text would make the data more accessible to readers.

While the manuscript does a commendable job of discussing various theoretical underpinnings of lobbying's influence on healthcare legislation, a clearer delineation of how these theories were applied to interpret the findings would strengthen the argument. A subsection explicitly connecting theoretical concepts to the analysis of empirical data could address this.

The manuscript touches upon the ethical boundaries of lobbying but does so somewhat briefly. Expanding this discussion to include more examples of where these boundaries have been challenged or crossed in healthcare lobbying would provide a richer context for the ethical considerations involved.

The conclusion effectively summarizes the study's findings but could further emphasize the practical implications for policy and governance. Highlighting specific recommendations for how regulatory frameworks might be adjusted in light of the study's findings would give the conclusion more weight.

Given the evolving nature of healthcare legislation and lobbying practices, referencing the most recent developments or cases (up to 2022) where lobbying has notably influenced healthcare policy would make the manuscript more timely and relevant.

Some technical terms and concepts are used inconsistently throughout the manuscript. A careful proofreading, possibly by a subject matter expert, would ensure that the terminology is used correctly and consistently, enhancing the manuscript's credibility.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.