

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_104374
Title of the Manuscript:	Coastal and Maritime Security of India in the Indian Ocean Region: Assessing the Challenges and Opportunities of SeaBed Mining
Type of the Article	Original research

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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary</p> <p>Main Notes first:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper needs a serious major review because it is not clear with the way it is written and structured. [See all corrections and comments in the attached Manuscript] 2. Read carefully the Author's instructions for citations and referencing... Must be redone in the paper... [See Comments] 3. Restructure the paper as suggested 4. Add a section for the Methodology and describe it... <p>The abstract is adequate, it represents the paper in its parts. However, needs to be more specific in terms of the methodology used.</p> <p>Keywords were removed in large numbers because you are allowed 6 to 8 only</p> <p>The introduction and background are not acceptable as is. Must include in an elaborated manner with details before going to the legal parts....</p> <p>Many more relevant references are needed to validate your arguments. Many facts must be elaborated. Needs editing and proofreading [see suggestions on attached Manuscript]</p> <p>The methodology is Missing!</p> <p>The arguments to support the discussion and the cases are not sufficient. Many examples and quantification of damage are needed to justify Court acts!!!</p> <p>The discussion is adequate, clear, and streamlined. However, needs proofreading and editing [see suggested corrections]</p> <p>The conclusion and recommendations need careful review</p> <p>Are there any limitations to the research???</p> <p>Review carefully the requirements of the Journal. Make sure the write-up of the references abide by the rules... Add all references here... If footnotes are needed create a section and number them here...</p> <p>Proofreading is needed [see suggestions throughout the text]</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon