Identification of Administrative Health Indicators and Anti-Corruption Measures

Zeinolabedi. Hosseinnejad Moziraji[1], Sanjar. Salajeghe[2*], Zahra. Anjamshoaa[3], Mohammad. Jalalkamali[3], Navid. Fatehi-Rad[3]

[1] PhD Student in Organizational Behavior Management, Department of Public Administration, Kerman Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kerman, Iran
[2] Department of Management, Kerman Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kerman, Iran
[3] Assistant Professor, Department of Governmental Management, Kerman Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kerman, Iran

* **Corresponding author email address**: S.Salajegheh@iauk.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Comment: The concept of "institutional corruption" could be expanded. Provide a clearer definition and examples to differentiate it from individual acts of corruption.

Methods and Materials, Paragraph 5:

Sentence: "The Delphi technique continued for two rounds and in the second round it was stopped after reaching final agreement."

Comment: Discuss the criteria for determining "final agreement" among experts. Include any statistical measures or thresholds used to make this determination.

Findings and Results, Paragraph 1:

Sentence: "Based on past studies, research literature, and conducted interviews, a total of 15 administrative health indicators were identified."

Comment: Consider providing a summary table or figure that visually presents the final set of indicators along with their definitions and significance.

Table 1:

Comment: Ensure that all sub-criteria in Table 1 are clearly defined. Some terms may require additional context or explanation to be fully understood by readers not familiar with the specific domain.

Findings and Results, Paragraph 2:

Sentence: "In the second step of the Delphi technique, initially, the 15 administrative health indicators were screened to select the criteria with greater importance and relevance."

Comment: Elaborate on the screening process and the specific criteria used to evaluate the importance and relevance of each indicator.

Authors revised the manuscript.

1.2.   Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Introduction, Paragraph 1:

Sentence: "Corruption in the healthcare sector is a pervasive issue that undermines the quality of healthcare services, increases costs, and erodes public trust."

Comment: Consider including recent statistics or specific examples to quantify the extent of corruption in healthcare. This will underscore the urgency and relevance of the study.

Introduction, Paragraph 3:

Sentence: "Institutional corruption in particular involves systemic issues within healthcare organizations and regulatory bodies that perpetuate corrupt practices."

Methods and Materials, Paragraph 1:

Sentence: "Participants were selected from among experts including managers, consultants, and specialists in the field of administrative health and anti-corruption within the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Finance."

Comment: Detail the criteria used for selecting these experts. How were they identified and what qualifications or experiences were deemed essential?

Methods and Materials, Paragraph 2:

Sentence: "Data collection was conducted in two main phases."

Comment: Clarify the time frame for each phase of data collection. This will help understand the duration and potential influences on expert opinions.

Methods and Materials, Paragraph 3:

Sentence: "Initially, 52 indicators related to administrative health and anti-corruption were identified from theoretical frameworks and prior studies."

Comment: Provide examples of some initial indicators identified and explain the process of refining these indicators through the Delphi rounds.

Discussion, Paragraph 1:

Sentence: "The findings highlighted the importance of intra-organizational factors such as workplace social support, sufficient salary and wages, and job security."

Comment: Compare these findings with similar studies in other sectors or regions. This will help to contextualize the results within a broader framework.

Discussion, Paragraph 3:

Sentence: "Consultative decision-making processes ensure that diverse perspectives are considered, enhancing transparency and reducing opportunities for corrupt practices."

Authors revised the manuscript.

2.   Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.