

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. The manuscript is important for scientific community. So, YES! 2. I think the title of this article is suitable. So, YES! 3. I am not satisfied to say the abstract of this article is comprehensive. A polite NO, please! 4. I am not satisfied to say the subsections and structure are appropriate. And that's a polite NO! 5. I am not satisfied to say the manuscript is scientifically correct. And that's also a polite NO! 6. Sufficiency of the references is determined by the context of the topic and available accessible literature. So, I can't judge a manuscript based on the number of its references. <u>Please find attached: I managed to provide my comments using the "review" panel inside the manuscript Microsoft Office file/document entitled Ms SAJSSE 96182 Revised JA.</u>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	John Alosias
Department, University & Country	University of Juba, South Sudan