

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_97745
Title of the Manuscript:	SMALL-SCALE FISHING COMMUNITY OF HAOR AREAS: WHAT MATTERS TO THEM
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:

(<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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	1. 1). The manuscript was submitted by the author as lack of scientific ideas:method so how to know? 2) Importance: In every paragraph, they only mention the text and there was no statistical analysis. 3) just observation by words, confidence, etc... 2. Title is OK 3. The abstract should include some suggestions from the last part of the article. 4. Not a research article, need to improve and add more scientific sections 5. No, need to add more materials and methods, statistical analysis,. Dicussion with more cited. 6. Need to cited by each reference	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English is OK	
Optional/General comments	It is a good investigation report the article but needs to major improvements, Editor can accept for major revision.	

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:	Nguyen Quang Linh
Department, University & Country	University of Agriculture and Forestry, Hue University, Vietnam