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Strengths of the paper

• Convincing discussion on why an index of socio-economic inequality of health should have the « mirror » and the symmetry properties:
  Ÿ good versus ill health
  Ÿ symmetric distribution of health around the median of income is not unequal
• Nice « axiomatic » derivations of sufficient and necessary conditions on the weighting and normalizing functions so that the index has those properties.
• Interesting developments on how to correct small sample biases with such indexes.
Some justification on why you choose a given index would be appreciated

• Great effort made by the authors to define a class of indexes verifying the symmetry and mirror properties.

• Authors pick up one index in the « mirror » group of indexes, and one in the « mirror + symmetry ».

• => a bit puzzling for the reader: very rigorous axiomatization and then you pick up one « arbitrarily »

• But there are plenty other indexes possible. For instance, regarding symmetry, \( \ln(1 + ((p-1/2)^2)^\alpha)(2p-1) \) is another possible weighting function.

• I recognize the \( \ln(1 + ((p-1/2)^2)^\alpha)(2p-1) \) example is somewhat stupid but some more discussion on why you specifically choose \( ((p-1/2)^2)^\alpha)(2p-1) \) would be appreciated.
Convince the reader that new indexes change something in assessment of health inequality

• Changing the value of distributional judgement parameters (v and α) change the absolute value of the indexes.
• But hardly changes country rankings (some exceptions: Brazil)
• Hardly changes assessment of whether inequality = pro-poor or pro-rich (some exceptions: Mozambique).
• In my view, most interesting contribution of the paper = symmetric index. But hardly any discussion on the extent to which using it changes rankings.
Conclusion: deepen the empirical analysis

• => in my view, to do justice to the very interesting theoretical contributions of the paper, need to deepen the empirical analysis, and demonstrate why using the symmetric index makes a difference wrt previous indexes.
• Deepening the analysis of country ranking in terms of socio-economic health inequality?
• Other idea: analysis of the evolution of socio-economic health inequality in a given country.