

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_99888
Title of the Manuscript:	Climate Change and Marine Fisheries: Stakeholders' Perspective from Coastal District of Odisha, India
Type of the Article	Short 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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. The theme addressed in the manuscript is of high relevance currently being one of the greatest current concerns of humanity and the scientific community. The results must be shown during the manuscript and compared with other scientific studies. Please, include references during the discussion to corroborate or show differences with your results. It is important to review all references and put in the requested format in the text and make sure if it is cited in the text and in the reference list. It is important to include ethical committees' authorization, authors contribution and other final aspects requested by the journal.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes, I just suggest to authors to evaluate the use of one word that best fit in the context.</p> <p>4. I missed the results.</p> <p>5. Yes, but I missed graphs and more information about respondents and focus group responses. In addition, the discussion only reports what the study found without relating it to findings in previous studies and references to the region or other locations in the world or close to the studied location.</p> <p>6. No. I asked through the text to include references and compare their results with previous information published in the theme.</p> <p>Please have a look in the suggestion I mentioned through the text as commentaries.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes, most of the time.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	I included all suggestions and necessities through the text.	

### 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juliana de Carvalho Gaeta
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Ceará, Brazil