

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_92896
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of The Exchange Rate of Small-scale Trammel Net Fishermen in Pangandaran District, Pangandaran Regency
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	<p>In the abstract section. Fisherman's Exchange Rate (NTN), should be abbreviated as FER instead of NTN, in the abstract and throughout the paper.</p> <p>Some typos were found and need to be fixed. The research method is mentioned census but in the research method section it is mentioned survey, which one is appropriate, must be consistent. The population of trammel net fishermen must be clearly stated including the size of the boat. The method of analysis needs to be clarified according to what is done. The results displayed should be a synthesis of the results of the analysis and discussion. The background has been well explained about the conditions of the research location and the results of previous studies. But the research question has not yet been seen, what is the real research problem. Table 1 displays data on shrimp production based on fish auction sites but there is no description of the problem, nor is there a relationship with the research location. The research objectives are not clearly stated.</p> <p>The research method is stated as a survey method but observing all members of the population so that it is more suitable for the census method.</p> <p>The data in table 8 needs to be explained in relation to table 1. In table 1 there are 3 groups of ships while in table 8 there are only 2 groups, why is it different.</p> <p>Data tables 9, 10, 11, 12,13 should relate to the size of the ship because if the ship is large the operational costs will be greater, but the range is further and the catch will be greater. Discussion about research results is still lacking, even though the essence of scientific writing lies in the discussion. Each table must be discussed, why the results are like that, what are the causes and supported by the results of previous studies. The discussion about the fisherman's exchange rate is also very minimal, why it is dominant <100, what it means and how to improve it so that it increases >100.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Revision required, technical and English	

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>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Najamuddin
Department, University & Country	Hasanuddin University, Indonesia