

Global Perspectives on Financing Higher Education: A Comparative Analysis

Ehsan. Ehteshamnejad^{1*}

¹ Department of Science, Technology and Innovation Economics and Financing, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Ehteshamnejad@nrisp.ac.ir

Editor

Mehdi Rostami
Department of Psychology and
Counseling, KMAN Research
Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario,
Canada
mehdirostami@kmanresce.ca

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Ali Sargolzaie
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Zahedan Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Zahedan, Iran.
Email: a.sargolzaie@iauzah.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Marco Yamba-Yugsi
Unidad Académica de Posgrado, Universidad Católica de Cuenca, Azuay 010101,
Ecuador
Email: marco.yamba@ucacue.edu.ec

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Strengths:

- Scope and Depth:** The article covers a wide range of global perspectives, offering a thorough comparative analysis.
- Relevance to Policy:** The findings are highly relevant for policymakers in the field of higher education.

Areas for Improvement:

- Empirical Data:** The inclusion of more empirical data could strengthen the arguments presented.
- Diversity of Sources:** Expanding the range of sources, including more diverse geographical and economic contexts, could enhance the study's comprehensiveness.

Recommendations:

- Future Research:** Further research could focus on empirical studies in specific countries to deepen the understanding of the models discussed.
- Policy Implications:** A more detailed discussion of policy implications for various countries could make the study more actionable for decision-makers.

Authors revised the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Evaluation and Suggestions:

- 1- **Contextual Analysis:** The article successfully situates higher education financing within the broader socio-economic context, highlighting its complexity.
- 2- **Comparative Approach:** The comparative analysis is well-executed, providing insightful distinctions between different global models.

Positive Aspects:

1. **Clarity and Structure:** The article is well-structured, presenting a clear and coherent argument.
2. **Theoretical Contribution:** It makes a valuable theoretical contribution to the field of education financing.

Critique:

1. **Generalizability:** The findings may have limited generalizability due to the narrative review approach.
2. **Depth of Analysis:** Some areas, such as the implications of private investment in higher education, could be explored in greater depth.

Authors revised the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.