

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_99669
Title of the Manuscript:	Characteristics of The Household-Scale Fisheries Industry In West Java
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/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)	1. The result of the study is important to increase preference consumer to fish product and healthy protein intake for population. Basic information for stakeholders to improve fish processing industry products, especially for home industries. 2. Yes. 3. Sufficient. 4. Yes. 5. The methodology of study must be well described and completely. 6. Yes. But, reference numbers in the manuscript are not arranged sequentially so it is difficult to check. Map of location of the study isn't available	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In some section must be checked	
Optional/General comments	Publish with Minor revisions	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leila Ariyani Sofia
Department, University & Country	Lambung Mangkurat University, Indonesia