

**Paper: “The Role of Multinational Pharmaceutical Companies in the Battle against COVID-19”**

**Submitted: 23 May 2022**

**Accepted: 27 July 2022**

**Published: 30 September 2022**

Corresponding Author: Sila Turac Baykara

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n28p35](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n28p35)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Berenyi Laszlo  
University of Miskolc, Hungary

Reviewer 2.: Ece Kuzulu  
İzmir Demokrasi University, Turkey

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 10.07.2022
Manuscript Title: The role of multinational pharmaceutical companies in the fight against Covid-19	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06.06.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The title raises awareness and shows the goals of the study.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>The abstract reflects the content properly, it gives a good overview. More results could have space in the abstract.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There are some mistakes, so a final grammar check is advised. At the same time, the text is readable.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The description of the methods has a short section, but highlighting the mixing of qualitative and quantitative methods goes beyond the content. Literature and secondary sources are shown.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The results are correct, and those are in line with the goals and data collection. Case studies of the results allow further investigations.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Conclusions are short but comprehensive and include both limitations and further directions.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The references include basic and recent sources. Some items are not found in the text; check it!</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The manuscript shows a valuable analysis in its field, I can recommend its publication after a minor revision. Consider the notes above. Make a final grammar and language proofreading, check and correct the list of references and check the figure headings. Title and source must be added, but as is required by the guidelines (do not add doi etc.)

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

-

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Date Manuscript Received: 21.07.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 25.07.2022
Manuscript Title: The role of multinational pharmaceutical companies in the fight against Covid-19	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>I recommend to use “battle” instead of fight in the title</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>There are minor spelling mistakes for example: COVAX was launched in April 2020 by the World Health Organization (WHO), the European Commission and France, with the support of pharmaceutical multinational corporations in response to an aggravation of the context in which the COVID-19 pandemic was <b>developing.states</b> the research question, why the research is important, and briefly reviews relevant literature and previous work.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>I did not understand this statement which is in the methods section: <b>Use this section to describe methods used, subjects studied, or materials utilized.</b></i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Conclusion section is short.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**