

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_85262
Title of the Manuscript:	REGULATORY SHIFT IN CHINA: EVOLUTION OF NMPA
Type of the Article	descriptive study

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>)

**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>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Regulatory rules in the biotechnology industry are essential for the safe distribution of products in the population. This is especially important in countries where many years of experience in traditional medicine and modern pharmacological products stand against each other. In addition, it must be borne in mind that in today's global world, there are essentially no borders and the export of these products is virtually uncontrollable. Therefore, an overview of the regulatory rules for these sectors in China is highly topical and necessary. I have a few comments on the text that need to be considered before publishing. The text is mostly descriptive and the authors' research creativity is not apparent. This is especially evident in the Discussion, which does not even hint at the results of the study. It is vague and does not have the character common in professional texts. The conclusion of the text is similarly general and vague. This will need to be amended and the text reassessed.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Formal division of the study, its limits and especially practical outputs and commentary of the presented data.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	A highly topical topic and therefore a study that needs to be formally finalized.	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Václav Bunc
Department, University & Country	Charles University, Czech Republic