

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_100388
Title of the Manuscript:	Implementation Strategy of Port Clearance at UNTIA Fishing Port Makassar City, Indonesia
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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, I think this manuscript is very timely and scientifically important. I would just like to point out the following comments:</p> <p>1.1 The authors need to explain a little more about the direct observation method by which they obtained their survey data. For example, from which date to which date and during which hours did they observe the fishing port?</p> <p>1.2 Also, how were the respondents selected for the questionnaire survey? And how were the structured interviews carried out?</p> <p>1.3 The above points are important because there may be selection bias that the authors didn't know about. For example, if they observed the port only during the day, then they may have missed the IUUF activities during night time. Also, if the surveys and interviews were done on a voluntary basis, then maybe only the fishermen with heavy complaints were willing to participate, while the happy and content fishermen were under-represented in the study.</p> <p>2. I think the title is accurate.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive enough.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct, to the best of my knowledge.</p> <p>6. The reference section is comprehensive enough.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eric A. L. Li
Department, University & Country	The University of Hong Kong, China