Dear editor,

We would like to thank you and the reviewers again for the opportunity to revise and improve our manuscript. We have taken the additional comments of the reviewers very seriously and have revised the manuscript accordingly. In the attached table we have listed the reviewers’ comments and suggestions and how we have improved the article on this basis.

Many thanks and best regards

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REVIEWER 1** | | | |
|  | **Short comment** | **Full comment** | **Response** |
| 1 | 6 vs 9 cluster | What is the difference between the methodological typology and the clusters (the '9' versus '6' argument)? Why is this important? Why do both approaches lead to different typologies and what does that tell us? | We think that we already address these questions in the discussion (However, our approach … which is highlighted). Yet, we extended the section by showing, how the narrow and wide solution can be used in further research. |
| 2 | Simplify the literature review | Introduction p11, 'long term classifications': here the authors provided a literature-based typology. I think this paragraph contains many concepts and choices that is not accounted for. I'd suggest to simplify a bit, also because having several kinds of typology in one manuscript is confusing. | We do not agree with the comment. The section ‘long-term care classifications’ does not provide a literature-based typology. Rather it reviews the literature on LTC typologies by showing, which dimensions have been frequently used and which clusters are found. We do not agree that the ‘paragraph contains many concepts and choices that is not accounted for’. The dimensions and the indicators discussed therein, are taken up in the empirical part of the paper. The review of earlier clusters is taken up in the discussion, when comparing our results to previous findings. Accordingly, we did not change this section. |
| 3 | More specific about institutional indicators | Furthermore, the authors state that they use 'institutional indicators'; can they be more specific about these indicators? And data collection in this respect? | We clarified, that ‘institutional indicators’ relate to specific measures and rules of the LTC system (p.6). We already state in this paragraph, how we collected the data: extracting information from various databases and checking of the values of our indicators by country experts. |
| 4 | Revise highlights | I'd like (again) to point at the 'highlights' at the start of the manuscript, that should provide a bullet-wise summary of the paper. Yet these 'highlights' are rather descriptive and broadly defined. Perhaps merge some of them to make the highlights more convincing? | We merged some of the highlights, as suggested. |
| **REVIEWER 3** | | | |
| 5 | Phrasing | The LTC clusters are however unexpected and difficult to comprehend sometimes. I'm aware that I'm already framed in a certain 'typology' mindset (e.g. Esping-Andersen); hence, this typology may actually be very valuable to broaden our horizons. However, this also implies that the authors of this manuscript have a more challenging task to describe their findings very clearly (e.g. embed them in 'reality') and to be very careful in their phrasing and terminology. I still feel there is some work to be done on this aspect. | In the first revision of the paper, a similar comment has been made. In that light, we deleted all interpretations of the values of indicators in the Results section and focued on an interpretation in the Discussion and Conclusion. The first two paragraphs of the Discussion embed our results in ‘reality’, i.e. relates the found clusters to each other and compares them to clusters of established typologies. However, we made some small changes to these paragraphs. |
| 6 | Renaming Clusters | there is still one major issue that I want to point out here:  Some of the clusters are named 'private supply system' and 'public supply system'. These terms are confusing because this manuscript does not include ownership differences on the supply side of the LTC system. (We have discussed this in the first review round. The authors did this for understandable reasons.) However, can the authors not use different terms for these clusters? It is, for example, quite confusing (and slightly frustrating) to read that Ireland falls under 'The public supply system' while currently three-quarters are provided by the for-profit sector in the LTC system. I think the authors mean more something along the lines of 'publicly financed supply system'. I think it can be easily solved by naming the clusters differently or to reflect on this in your discussion using the case of Ireland as an example. I personally prefer the former option. | We understand the unease concerning the labels of the clusters. However, changing ‘public’ and ‘private’ into ‘public-financed’ and ‘private-financed’ does not mirror the indicators, we include in the ‘public-private mix’ dimension (share of private expenditure as % of total expenditure , availability of cash benefits). We therefore want to stick with the current labels. We explain throughout the manuscript, which dimensions and indicators are used and what they stand for. Furthermore, in the results section we describe the clusters and what is unique about them (11-13). This should make it clear to the reader what the labels mean and how they can be understood. |
| 7 | Shift paragraph form conclusion to discussion | One other (minor) thing, which I did not notice in the first round, is that one (long) paragraph in the conclusion (i.e. "Typologies always imply generalizations. …. Family and migrant care.") belongs, in my opinion, in the discussion. | We moved this paragraph from the Conclusion into the Discussion. |