

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_101604
Title of the Manuscript:	Fish-Based Aqua-tourism Centre for Development of Economical, Environmental and Cultural Security- A Case Study at Jasingfaa Aqua-tourism Centre, Nagaon, Assam, India
Type of the Article	Case study

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 (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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript sheds light on a lesser-researched region.</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>Yes, the references are sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The following minor changes should be made in the highlighted portions-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On page number 4, subsection 2.1 Data has a reference – (Mandal et al., 2018). This seems to be in a different font (Calibri). The font of this reference should be changed to Times New Roman. On page number 9, subsection 3.1 Impact analysis of Jasingfaa on local community and its surrounding environment, has a reference – (Arlinghaus and Cooke, 2009). This seems to be in a different font (Calibri). The font of this reference should be changed to Times New Roman. Also, the font size of this should be changed from 11 to 12. On page number 9, subsection 3.1 Impact analysis of Jasingfaa on local community and its surrounding environment, has a reference – (Baruah and Sarma, 2018). This seems to be in a different font (Calibri). The font of this reference should be changed to Times New Roman. Also, the font size of this should be changed from 11 to 12. 	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sargam Mehra
Department, University & Country	School of Media and Communication Studies, Doon University, India