Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_81725**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The pharmaceutical policy reforms in Greece during the economic crisis, 2010-2015**
Type of the Article	**Policy 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	This manuscript provides important information about the pharmaceutical policy reforms in Greece during the economic crisis, 2010-2015. The information presented in this manuscript is very important in the context about new legislation starting from the first memorandum until the first quarter of 2014 and the new drug pricing policies, profit control regulations, and demand regulations. Some corrections need to be made, in order to publish the manuscript. Please, take into account the following recommendations to improve this manuscript: - the general presentation of the manuscript should be reviewed, the extra spaces between words or the lack of spaces between titles, subtitles and text according to the requirements of the journal; - I recommend a revision of the manuscript according to the requirements of the journal (English, technical editing, bibliography, etc.); - bibliographic references 13, 15 and 27 are not inserted in the text; - the theoretical documentation of the study is fragile, I recommend including a larger number on studies on the subject (materials, reports, publications etc.) which offers a direct treatment of the subject to research; - I recommend clearer wording and shortening of the Conclusions, as the current form contains information that should be included in the other chapters; - subtitle 3.2 is missing; - elimination of bibliographic references 38 and 39 from the chapter of Conclusions and their insertion in the other subchapters; - the critical approach of specialized literature that will allow the analysis and interpretation of information, the development of a objective point of view and the establishment of clear objectives. I recommend a carefully check of the full manuscript to correct any grammatical or syntax error. Based on the above mentioned, I recommend this paper for publication after performing the suggested corrections.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Daniela Stoin**
Department, University & Country	**Banat's University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania**