



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_30756
Title of the Manuscript:	Key Performance Indicators - Comparative Analysis for Major Brands of Pharmaceutical Production Industry in Romania
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	• It is a mere descriptive analysis. The authors don't extract any conclusion about the pharmaceutical sector in Romania. • Depending in financial data which firms do they believe will survive and which will have to close? • Aare those financial ratios explaining an efficient management? • In table 3 average ROA for RPH is not correct • I don't agree with this assertion: "small indicators of the other companies such as Ropharma and Remedia do not indicate a week company or a bad investment but rather a smaller business with a more restricted activity but one that could be prone to development" Could you explain what do you mean? Because what I see is a company (RPH) with the worst financial rates in all the variables what means that it is not ruled properly. I don't understand the meaning of the survey with managers. It doesn't incorporate any new conclusion (at least they are not included in conclusions). It is not necessary	• Conclusions regarding the Romanian pharmaceutical sector were added. • Based on the financial data, in the section conclusion, information about the companies' survival has been added. • As added in the new section, we do have effective management for 3 companies: ATB, SCD and BIO. • No comment - Avg. ROA for RPH was corrected. • The sentence was rephrased. • 6. I agree, the methodology was not proper for that. It served as an insight for our next article in the field.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		