

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_97902
Title of the Manuscript:	PRODUCTIVITY ANALYSIS OF FISH FARMING IN FLOATING NET CAGES IN LAKE TOBA (CASE STUDY IN PANGURURAN SUBDISTRICT, SAMOSIR DISTRICT)
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The results of this study raise several questions that make the results doubtful. The discussion in this article is also very lacking so that it has not been properly answered why such research results were obtained Please see the comments I gave to the manuscript to see the results of a more detailed review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are several grammar errors in the manuscript. It is advisable to do proofreading on the manuscript • The state of the art and gap analysis from this research need to be sharpened • Use updated references. Some of the references you used are old • Explain in the manuscript about the weaknesses of this study • In Conclusion, explain the benefits of this study and suggestions for further research • Research methods need to be more detailed <p>See the attachment</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	This article needs to go through the proofreading process	
Optional/General 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jamaluddin
Department, University & Country	Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia