



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_63341
Title of the Manuscript:	Discussion on Biotechnology and Food Policy: Taking China's Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs)
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper presents elements of originality, bringing additional knowledge through the results of the research undertaken. The author presents in his/her personal manner and nuances through his/her own determinations the information in the field of the paper</p> <p>The abstract of the paper informs about the conceptual framework, the purpose of the article, and the main results obtained</p> <p>The author explains the context in which s/he treats the subject of the paper and calls for sufficient references from the existing literature for the chosen topic. I consider that this section respects the conditions imposed by the journal, pointing very well the content of the paper and clearly specifying the problem investigated</p> <p>The paper presents the relevant literature, which is updated, building a good context for further research. The section responds to the information requirements in an orderly and sufficiently rich sequence. The paper does not establish hypotheses. The paper presents a theoretical study that takes into account several approaches to the studied concepts</p> <p>The results and discussions section is not very well argued. You can also complete the conclusions section</p>	



[SDI 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lazar Cristina Mihaela
Department, University & Country	Ovidius University Of Constanta, Romania