

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_104050
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of the Economic Potential of the Fisheries Sector as a Basic Sector in Cianjur Regency West Java Province
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 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, it is important for scientific community as it presents the study on the economic potential of the Fisheries sector in Cianjur Regency of West Java Province. 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive and specified. 4. Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. However, the discussion part needs to be elaborated in comparison with other previous studies. 6. Yes, the references are recent but not sufficient. Some of the references are incorrectly written.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications but need some improvement.	
Optional/General comments		

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 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sushree Sangeeta Dey
Department, University & Country	ICAR-Central Institute of Fisheries Education, India