

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81344
Title of the Manuscript:	An Analysis of Backward and Forward Linkages of Pharmaceutical Sector in India Based on an Input- Output Model
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

<https://www.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

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	<p>1) We recommend that author should choose at least 10 economic activities, considered as representative for the Indian economy from the point of view of input-output an analysis. It is recommendable to present the criteria used for the respective choose. Among the considered economic activities, it is important to include the ones which have the minimum and maximum sizes of the multipliers.</p> <p>2) It is necessary to introduce in the paper two chapters related to: a) input multipliers and backward linkages and b) output multipliers and forward linkages. It is important to present the multipliers size and afterwards the size of the linkages.</p> <p>3) Based on the multipliers and linkages size it is possible to define the role played by the pharmaceutical industry in the framework of Indian economy. Also, there are created premises to draw comparison between the pharmaceutical industry and the other considered industries.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	We recommend to extend the bibliography concerning the input-output analysis to about 20-25 titles. It is necessary to include the work of W. Leontief, cited at the page 2 in the bibliography presented at the end of the paper	
O+ptional/General comments +	The proposed article has some interesting issues and may be published if the recommendations would be implemented.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Florin Marius Pavelescu
Department, University & Country	Romania