

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJFAR_94165 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | ANALYSIS OF VALUE ADDED PRODUCTS OF TENGGIRI FISH DRIED BATAGOR AT PT HADE BOGATAMA NUSANTARA, BANDUNG CITY |
| Type of the Article | Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/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 | Citations for preamble statements and research methods. A detailed description of parameters and methods of use Provides data for results from 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6 Rewrite the paragraphs in the introduction, results, and conclusion. Complement the argumentation of findings and develop information from research findings. And Please check the attached draft | |
| Minor REVISION comments | Please check the attached draft | |
| Optional/General comments | The manuscript presents a basic economic analysis for product B which is a traditional food in A. However, the objectives and methods of use as well as the results presented have not been presented. meet the requirements of a scientific paper. The introductions, methods, and results are to be written in descriptive form. The research methods are not referenced. The statistics obtained are too few. Arguments for evaluating and comparing results were also not found in the manuscript. Conclusions are subjective and lack a scientific basis. References are too poor. This manuscript will be not interesting for this journal, the processing will get a better product and a higher value for producers and homemakers, what we would like to see? . English editing and plagiarism are OK, I have checked ready and good writing. | |

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: | Nguyen Quang Linh |
| Department, University & Country | Hue University, Vietnam |