

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_97303
Title of the Manuscript:	THE IMPACT OF DIGITAL MARKETING ON SALES LEVELS OF ORNAMENTAL BETTA FISH (<i>Betta splendens</i> Regan 1910) IN THE MUARA FISH MARKET, BANDUNG CITY
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)
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)	Yes The title can be modified to read , survey on the effects of Internet technology in the marketing development of beta splendens market in Mura Indonesia Abstract needs to be re written. There were somuch errors Can be improved upon. There is no population size to be sampled The manuscript had no sample size, the work was not discussed, it can not be said to be a good scientific correct document Very short references The work has many grammatical error. I could not understand the authors. They confused themselves along the line. The work needs to be done with correct English. The questionnaire was not validated. No sample size. You do not go and start taking data without planning	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No no no	
Optional/General comments	The concept is good. How re write the work, It doesn't have discussion too	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	U.D Enyidi
Department, University & Country	Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria