

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research.
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_96182
Title of the Manuscript:	Informal Education has Aided the Fisherwomen in their Fight to Survive in the Fish Market
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.journalsajisse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/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. Problems related to raising literacy and ensuring gender equality are still relevant in many countries of the world. Thus, research related to the detection of the mentioned problems and the possibilities of their solution is interesting for the scientific community. 2. The title of the article corresponds to its content; however, in my opinion, the following option would be better: "The Role of Informal Education in Fisher Women's Struggle for Survival in the Fish Market." 3. The abstract of the article includes basic information. 4. The structure of the article corresponds to the standards. 5. Research methodology is correctly selected. 6. Reference is sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English language proficiency is suitable for scholarly communication.	
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:	Giuli Giguashvili
Department, University & Country	Gori State University, Georgia