

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_96413
Title of the Manuscript:	POTENTIAL EDIBLE FILM BIOCOMPOSITE (GELATIN, NANOCHITOSAN, AND BEESWAX) FOR EXTEND SHELF LIFE PANGASIVUS FILLETS BASED ON ORGANOLEPTIC CHARACTERISTICS, ROTTENNESS, AND PH: A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Less information or statement from the writers, especially at Introduction to declare Aim/Objective Research after present previous researchers to blow up advantage & disadvantage, and find the novelty A little suitable if comparing with the content Abstract must contain at least aim / objective, method, scientific results, and brief conclusion Please, recheck with template This is scientific, but the writer will do many corrections to build comprehensive manuscript That's fine	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Enough	
Optional/General comments	Abstract must contain at least aim / objective, method, scientific results, and brief conclusion. Introduction must contain literatures of existing conditions (previous studies), the methods currently applied to overcome the problem and the aim/objective. The writers just get to do point in Edible Film for methods, there are no other methods. Well, even this review article, be better if adding systematically research method. After that, give the detailed discussion and compared with the results of other literatures. Conclusion should be the answer for the aim/objective, without repeating from the sentences before.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dessy Agustina Sari
Department, University & Country	Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang, Indonesia