

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)	Considering the importance of the marine environment and human impact on the coasts and seas, the article has scientific content for the audience. according to the comment in the text of the article to be corrected. according to the comment in the text of the article to be corrected. OK OK It is recommended to use more recent sources in the introduction and discussion section of the article. It seems that the number of sources is low.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	OK	
Optional/General comments	A proper scientific article has been written, so it can be accepted and published.	

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:	Mohammad Velayatzadeh
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran