

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_95456
Title of the Manuscript:	Adoption of Aquaculture Technologies and Management Practices, Challenges and Productivity of Fish-Ponds in Kakamega County, Kenya
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>[1] Yes it's a good paper and will contribute to the development of agriculture</p> <p>[2] I think you should change the title to something not using the word adoption because, when I read the title, I assume that writer will use certain adoption theory for the study. I failed to find the theory in the paper.</p> <p>[3] This is an interesting study analyzing the adoption of best technological and management practices, challenges and productivity of fish-ponds among smallholder aquaculture farmers in Kakamega County, Kenya.</p> <p>[4] When it comes to discussions of the brain, the finding is interesting. The subsection is good.</p> <p>[5] Yes it is correct, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>[6] It is suggested that the writer add more literature review of the subject matter.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Need some paragraph rephrase in some part especially in the methodology section.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The article is well-written, organised, and of high quality. I would be happy to recommend the manuscript for Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research as it is an example of good study on the subject matter.	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eleanor Daniella Binti Lokman
Department, University & Country	Malaysia