

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_98752
Title of the Manuscript:	Perceived Benefits of FishCORAL-Related Coastal Resource Management Interventions in Ragay, Camarines Sur
Type of the 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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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. Yes, definitely, I would appreciate authors' attempt to bring such study for coastal communities. It is important as the present study focused on the scientific awareness about Coastal Resource Assessment to the coastal communities. 2. Title is okay. 3. Abstract is okay and the comments made in the manuscript 4. No, Results must be improved as the objectives b & c mentioned in abstract is missing in the manuscript. The presentation of results of the study very general information in sense. Author must include tabular and graphical representation of the data in a statistical format (Basic) so the research results could be understood clearly to the readers. 5. No, in present form, the manuscript is not written based on a scientific content. 6. Few reference needs to be added and I mentioned in manuscript also. I believe the required changes could improve the quality of the manuscript for publication in the journal. Therefore, the manuscript can be published after all corrections or comments made address properly. Thank You.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English language is perfect. No such serious grammatical errors have been found.	
Optional/General comments	All comments and clarification is asked in manuscript text by the track change mode.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Koushik Sadhukhan
Department, University & Country	National Centre for Coastal Research, India