**Supplemental materials for online**

**Existing welfare typologies**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Citation** | **Type** | **Types/Clusters** |
| Esping-Andersen (1990) | 18 countriesDecommodificationSocial stratificationPublic-private mix | **Liberal**AustraliaCanadaIrelandNZUKUSA | **Conservative**FinlandFranceGermanyJapanItalySwitzerland | **Social democratic**AustriaBelgiumNetherlandsDenmarkNorwaySweden |  |  |
| Castles and Mitchell (1993) | 14 countriesAggregate welfare expenditureBenefit equality | **Liberal**IrelandJapan SwitzerlandUSA | **Conservative**GermanyItalyNetherlands | **Non-Right hegemony**BelgiumDenmarkNorwaySweden |  | **Radical**AustraliaNZUK |
| Bonoli (1997) | 16 countriesSocial expenditure % GDPSocial expenditure financed via contributions | **British**IrelandUK | **Continental**BelgiumFranceGermanyLuxembourgNetherlands | **Nordic**DenmarkFinlandNorwaySweden | **Southern**GreeceItalyPortugalSpain Switzerland |  |
| Pitzruzzello (1999) | 18 countriesCluster analysis of decommodification | **Liberal**CanadaIrelandUKUSA | **Christian Democrat**BelgiumNetherlandsGermanyFranceItalySwitzerland | **Social democratic**BelgiumDenmarkNorwaySweden | **Conservative-Bismarckian**AustriaFinlandFranceItalyJapan | **Radical**AustraliaNZ |
| Bambra (2005) | 18 countriesHealthcare services and decommodification | **Liberal**AustraliaJapanUSA | **Conservative**AustriaBelgiumCanadaDenmarkFranceItaly | **Social Democratic**FinlandNorwaySweden | **Conservative subgroup**GermanySwitzerlandNetherlands | **Liberal subgroup**IrelandUKNZ |
| Bambra (2007) | Defamilisation and welfare regimes – cluster analysis | AustraliaUSA | CanadaFinlandUK | NorwaySweden | AustriaBelgiumFranceGermanyNetherlandsNZPortugalSwitzerland | ItalyJapanUnclearDenmarkIrelandGreeceSpain |
| Castles and Obinger (2008) | 20 countries, cluster analysis – k=5 version | **English** **Speaking**CanadaUK AustraliaUSAIreland | **Continental (North)**AustriaGermanyBelgiumFinlandFranceNetherlandsPortugal | **Scandinavian**SwedenDenmarkFinlandNorway | **Continental (South)**ItalySpainGreece | **English ‘stepchildren’**JapanSwitzerland |
| Castles and Obinger (2008) | 20 countries, cluster analysis – k=3 version | **English (liberal)**CanadaUK AustraliaUSAIrelandJapanSwitzerland | **Continental (conservative)**AustriaGermanyBelgiumFinlandFranceNetherlandsPortugalItalySpainGreece | **Scandinavian (social democratic)**SwedenDenmarkFinlandNorway |  |  |
| Wendt (2014) | 32 countriesCluster analysis of health data |  | **Low spend, high public, low OOP, access control very high**AustraliaCzechiaDenmarkEstoniaHungaryIrelandItalyNetherlandsPolandSlovakiaSloveniaUK | **Average spend, high public, low OOP, access strict**FinlandIcelandPortugalSpainSweden | **High spend, highest public, low OOP, free choice**AustriaBelgiumCanadaFranceGermanyJapanLuxembourgNZ | **Unclassified**GreeceKoreaNorwaySwitzerlandUSA |
| Reibling et al (2019) | 29 countriesCluster analysis of health data including outcomes | **Supply and performance private**SwitzerlandUSA | **Supply and choice public**AustraliaAustriaBelgiumCzechiaGermanyFranceIrelandIcelandLuxembourgSlovenia | **Performance and Primary Care public**FinlandJapanKoreaNorwayNZPortugalSweden | **Regulation public systems**CanadaDenmarkSpainItalyNetherlandsUK | **Low supply and low performance mixed**EstoniaHungaryPolandSlovakia |
| Greener (2020) | 11 countries, healthcare financing and outcomes – not mutually exclusive categories | **High spend, high OOP, low Voluntary insurance**NorwaySwitzerlandSweden |  | **High Gov, Low Voluntary insurance**GermanyNetherlandsNZNorwaySwedenUK | **High spend, high GOV, low OOP**FranceGermanyNetherlands | **Low spend, low Gov, high OOP, high Voluntary insurance**Australia |

Green = low set of countries

Red = high set of countries