

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_93548
Title of the Manuscript:	VALUE-ADDED ANALYSIS AND MARKETING OF FISH OTAK-OTAK “SELARAS”
Type of the Article	Case 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.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/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	<p>It is good effort and manuscript is well organized. However, it has a few fundamental mistakes that need to be addressed before publication.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author mentioned that he/she used interview, logging, and observation while he/she asserted that he used quantitative methodology. Admitting this is a conceptual mistake because these data collection tools are used in qualitative not in quantitative. (see guidelines by cresswell). 2. Author mentioned it is a case study. To my understanding, case is examination of specific problem of a group or a company while author narrated the problem as generic. So, the author should mentioned for which group or company, he/she is addressing the problem rather for whole industry, otherwise it is basic research not case study. 3. Implications in are very weak. 4. Research methodology part need careful attention 5. How data is treated and analysed is missing. 6. Need more reference for justification of claims asserted in research 	
Minor REVISION comments	Diagrams and tables should be properly labelled, if diagram is adopted must mention the source,	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Rafiq
Department, University & Country	Superior University, Pakistan