

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_103056
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF THE BUSINESS REVITALIZATION OF VANAME SHRIMP (LITOPENAEUS VANNAMEI) AND MILK FISH CULTIVATION TRADITIONALLY POLICULTURAL BASED ON WATER QUALITY ANALYSIS : Case Study in Muara Kintap Village, Kintap District, Tanah Laut Regency
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>)

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>1. This manuscript is important for scientific community because presents a case study for an important economic activity for the inhabitants of Indonesia.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>A map with the location of the studied area would be useful. What elements are FC and VC made up of? The work has, in my opinion, two parts, the one in which the economic analysis is done and the one in which the quality of the water in the ponds is analysed. A connection between the two parts is not very described, in the sense that the economic analysis does not include the costs for bringing the water quality to the required standards, respectively the increase in profit that would result from the improvement of the water quality.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is appropriate for scholarly communications, the presentation is clear and followable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<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:	Erika Beilicci
Department, University & Country	University of Timisoara, Romania