



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- The aim of this study has not been fulfilled based on the results of this paper - The Methodology and analysis used is not the best way to achieve the objectives of this study. - Adequacy of literature review: The author has not provided enough background information about the topic.	- Yes the aim was too broad. Now it's rethought and rephrased to be more accurate. - No, the used methods, techniques and tools were chosen adequately though not to the too board aim. After reconsidering and rephrasing it, one can see that the chosen set of methods was correct - Yes, the literature review is now fixed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Originality: more than 80% - Depth of Research: 80% - Bibliography/References: needs to be in alphabetical order - Results: The writer needs to summarize major points and point out the significance of these results. - Discussion: The author needs to discuss the results in the paper and compare to other research.	- Yes, bibliography has been fixed - Yes, results have been pointed out
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- The Abstract: The reader cannot have a good idea about this paper from the abstract. - The introduction does not grab the reader's attention.	- Yes the Abstract has been rewritten to be more explanatory - Introduction has been rewritten and better structured