

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_105289
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring Fish Consumption Patterns: A Comparative Study of Urban and Rural Households in Kawardha Block, Chhattisgarh
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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The research is very relevant to scientific community.</p> <p>The title is adequate and suitable.</p> <p>The author needs to highlight the statistical tools used for data analysis and include percentage values to the findings.</p> <p>The subsections and structure are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript requires major revision to get it up to standard.</p> <p>There is gross lack of references. Only three citations were cited in the manuscript. This is highly inadequate.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language is adequate for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The introduction section should be thoroughly revised. Apart from the importance of fish that was well elaborated, no other information was provided. For instance, no literature was presented to describe the study location in relation to and fish industry in terms of number of rural and urban areas, population, sources of fish, economic of fish, etc.</p> <p>Methodology, Author should make include how data were collected, particularly the parameters used to measure the variables.</p> <p>Results and Discussion There is no discussion. The author merely presented findings and moved on. Some of the figures presented as percentages are doubtful and questionable as to how the analysis was carried out. Please revisit your analysis.</p>	

[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:	Anayochukwu Victor Eze
Department, University & Country	Kenyatta University, Kenya