

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJFAR_101879</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The relationship between the level of knowledge of quality and price of biodegradable tote bags from seaweed carrageenan (<i>Eucheuma cottoni</i>) Against Purchasing Decisions</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Yes Sure</b></p> <p>Try to reframe in a fluent way. and add the type of study. It's better not to put( ) in the title.</p> <p><b>better to add a structured abstract. Better to edit the language ,difficult to read.Free online websites are also present.</b></p> <p><b>Results and discussion are better separated. Recommendations and limitations are better to include.</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Different format in the text; usually, some German journals will follow. Follow our journal guidelines.</b></p> <p><b>Key words are better to be in alphabetical order and in MeSH terms, not in the title.</b></p> <p><b>Aims and objectives are better added to methods.</b></p> <p><b>The introduction has too many paragraphs.</b></p> <p><b>sample size calculation, it is better to add.</b></p> <p><b>It is better to shorten the methodology and subsections.</b></p> <p><b>Conclusions should not have any numbers.</b></p> <p><b>Discussion: It's better to elaborate.</b></p> <p><b>There is no need to explain every test; readers want to see the inference, and for experts, there is no need for any explanatory statistics.</b></p> <p><b>What measures should be taken to decrease the bias? E.g., the test was taken by a third person who was not involved in the study.</b></p> <p><b>Was the questionnaire standardised by any tests?</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Better to improve</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rakesh Kotha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Osmania Medical College, India</b>