

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>1. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>2. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>3. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>4. 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>The article presents a monograph describing a case of ecotourism based on recreational fishing. The case study concerns a pioneering water tourism centre, the Jasingfaa Water Tourism Centre, located in the central district of Nagaon, in Assam (India).</p> <p>1 - The title of the article and its summary are relevant to the issue addressed. The work is clearly presented in the introduction.</p> <p>2 - The writing is clear and the reader has no difficulty understanding it. Who might find this document useful? A potential tourist, as the region studied seems to have a wide range of undeniable tourist attractions. The article could have used a map to locate the study area, rather than just giving its latitude and longitude.</p> <p>3 - The article is a little less suitable for a researcher because the scientific contribution, particularly in terms of methodology, is weak, but this is undoubtedly not its vocation... The proposed study method is based on survey data and various documents and articles. A few graphs are proposed on simple data in absolute values. These are very basic methods of analysis. There is no simple or composite criterion analysis, and no modelling whatsoever, as the subject perhaps does not lend itself to this. On the other hand, the layout of the article is broadly appropriate. It should be noted, however, that heading 3 is the subject of a long list of scattered points. Technical arguments are set out alongside economic arguments which appear somewhat scattered and could be better grouped together.</p> <p>There are a few inconsistencies in the written expression and plan, particularly with two successive levels of plan with no intermediate transition. On page 3, for example, we read :</p> <p>2. Materials and methods: 2.1 Data: Two levels of outline follow one another without a transition sentence indicating to the reader the different axes developed in each of the lower-level subdivisions. The reader needs to know from the outset what themes are covered in the lower-level subdivisions. This asperity appears several times in the article. It is also unusual to punctuate headings with the punctuation mark :. These two dots suggest the writing of a title complement that does not appear in the article. It should also be noted that, in the graphs proposed, the ordinate variable frequently appears in the title of the graph and is omitted on the graph's ordinate axis.</p> <p>4 - The bibliographical references for recent and less recent periods adequately cover the subject of the article. The article seems to us to be of very modest scientific quality because of its basic methodology (but could more have been done in the analysis of what is a micro-project?) but of better established empirical interest. It seems to us that it could be published as a descriptive and informative monograph on a case study. We are in favour of publishing the article after correcting the asperities mentioned above.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Overall, the article is written in acceptable academic English.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	No specific 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yvars Bernard</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Bordeaux, France</b>