

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_102867
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPLIANCE ANALYSIS OF INDONESIAN FIELD STANDARD CLASSIFICATION (KBLI 10293) IN THE FREEZING SHRIMP INDUSTRY IN BANJARMASIN CITY
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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community especially of agricultural industry perspectives in respective country (Indonesia).</p> <p>2. The recommended of title for the manuscript is AN COMPLIANCE ANALYSIS OF FIELD STANDARD CLASSIFICATION (KBLI 10293) IN THE FREEZING SHRIMP INDUSTRY IN BANJARMASIN CITY, INDONESIA</p> <p>3. The abstract was not comprehensive and the comments are stated in red colour of texts.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure must be clearly. The author's need to briefly describe the research objectives, research questions, problem statement, research contributions and recommendations of the study.</p> <p>5. The author's need to clearly on the research methodology method. More explanations on the research design and sampling design. The elaborations on the research findings are clearly. More justify and elaborate on it.</p> <p>6. There are lacked on connected elaboration between research findings and conclusion.</p> <p>7. There are some errors on the writing of the references. Use the APA format. The author's need to clearly the techniques of academic writing on result & research findings.</p> <p>8. There are lacked in conclusion and recommendations to the study. Need more elaboration on it.</p> <p>(All comments are stated in red colour of texts)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The author's need to focus and comprehensive of explanations and justification of the research findings, conclusion and recommendations. The language/English quality is very good.</p> <p>(All comments are stated in red colour of texts)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are some errors on the technique of writing especially the table/diagram. Please followed the APA format of research writing.</p> <p>(All comments are stated in red colour of texts)</p>	

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:	Mustafa Bin Dakian
Department, University & Country	Graduate School of Business Universititun Abdul Razak, Malaysia