

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_103894
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Community Participation Level in Aquaculture in Situraja District, Sumedang 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>important</p> <p>ok</p> <p>Less comprehensive</p> <p>Many improvements to make it easy to understand</p> <p>less scientific</p> <p>References that support the results of research in this manuscript are still lacking so it needs to be added with new references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of articles is low for scientific communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - should be comprehensive.....summarize the problem, research objectives, methodology briefly, and what resulted from this study and conclusions. <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The background is too short and less informative with the research done - The problem is not clear, - Lack of references. <p>Material and methods,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - needs an explanation of the stages of activity to obtain data according to the activity (descriptive with a qualitative approach)..... added Reference in methodology. - Primary and secondary data retrieval techniques are described in detail ...Reference ? - Questionnaire data collection technique to 50 respondents.... through interviews or online media systems and add data support reference ...? - Formula:Total score...?, percentage score....?, participation index ???, must be complete... please check back. <p>Results and discussion,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - very minimal data so less informative - minimal discussion and less references - many improvements <p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimal new references... - Small number of references - Reference.....for example... Azhar, F. N. Perception And Community Participation Towardstwice appeared 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Brata Pantjara
Department, University & Country	Research Center for Fishery, Indonesia