ISSLP
Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law and Politics

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Effect of Legal Uncertainties on the Pharmaceutical Industry

Amanda Cole-Heath[1,2*], Pavani Sagiraju[3]

[1] Department of Health Research, New Delhi, India
[2] Cancer Research UK, London, UK
[3] Faculty of Law, Bilkent University, 06800 Bilkent, Ankara, Turkey

*** Corresponding author email address**: amandacole-heath@ucl.ac.uk

Received: 2023-10-09	**Revised:** 2023-11-03	**Accepted:** 2023-11-12	**Published:** 2024-01-01

EDITOR:
Kaushalya Koralage
Assistant Lecturer in Sociology at University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka
koralage@iouc.cmb.ac.lk
REVIEWER 1:
Abdus Samad
Assistant Professor, Department of Law, AWKUM, Pakistan
abdussamad@awkum.edu.pk
REVIEWER 2:
Mehmet Yaşar
Department of Sociology, Boğaziçi University, 34342 Bebek, Istanbul, Turkey
mehmetyasardo@bogazici.edu.tr

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The abstract should concisely summarize the main findings and implications of the study rather than only describing the study's purpose and methodology. The introduction would benefit from a clearer articulation of the research question and hypotheses, possibly through a more structured presentation of the background information.

While the literature review is extensive, it could be improved by including a critical analysis of how previous studies directly relate to your findings. This could involve discussing the methodologies used in previous studies and their limitations, which your study seeks to address.

The method section should provide more details on the criteria for participant selection. Clarify why these particular professionals were chosen and how they represent the broader target population within the pharmaceutical industry. Additionally, discussing any potential biases introduced by the purposive sampling would strengthen the research's credibility.

The description of the thematic analysis could be more detailed. Specify the criteria used for forming and refining codes, and discuss the reliability and validity measures taken during the coding process, such as inter-coder reliability checks.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Specify the version of NVivo used for data analysis to allow for reproducibility of the study. Additionally, consider enhancing the methodological description by including how themes were prioritized or ranked in terms of their impact on the industry.

The section on ethical considerations should detail any ethical dilemmas encountered during the study, especially related to confidentiality and the handling of sensitive information within the interviews.

The results section could be reorganized to better align with the research questions. Presenting the results under headings that correspond directly to the research questions would help in maintaining a logical flow and making it easier for readers to follow the argumentation.

The limitations section should not only mention the generalizability of the findings but also discuss the limitations in the data collection method, such as the potential for bias in self-reported data from interviews.

Include a subsection that discusses practical applications of the research findings. Offering specific recommendations for how pharmaceutical companies can better manage legal uncertainties could make the paper more valuable to industry professionals.

Ensure all references are up to date and include any recent publications that could reinforce the study's framework. This is especially important in a rapidly evolving field like pharmaceutical regulation.

Improve the overall readability of the paper by reducing jargon and explaining complex concepts more thoroughly. This will make the paper more accessible to a broader audience, including policymakers and practitioners who may not have a deep background in legal aspects of pharmaceutical management.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.