

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_121572
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of the RMAT Designation on Biotechnology Stock Prices, Drug Development Timelines and Outcomes: An Empirical Analysis
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript shows the effect that RMAT created for the small companies to increase their stock prices which states the introducing the new techniques or therapies which would lead the scientific community to work on such new therapies for drug development and modifying the conventional drug entity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Go with a little more descriptive way and elaborate the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Correction at page no. 4 subsection numbering should be 2.2 instead of 2.1. Numbering of points in subsection use alphabets or roman numbers. Placing of graphs should be in the results where its description or result is been discussed instead of placing all of them at the end in collective manner.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is robust as its explains the RMAT technique in the research field and also gives the information regarding its impact on the market as well as on the development of the drug.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There some grammatical mistakes just over go through it. Otherwise, the English quality of article is good.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shubham Appanna Kotagi
Department, University & Country	Siddhi's Institute of Pharmacy, India