

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_99124
Title of the Manuscript:	PROCESSING AND SENSORY QUALITY OF DRIED REBON SHRIMPS FROM THE KATAPANG DOYONG COASTAL AREA, PANGANDARAN REGENCY
Type of the Article	Method 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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>Yes, it is. Though, the author need to properly present the keywords. For instance, the manuscript talked about the production processes and organoleptic properties of shrimps but did not highlight how they influence each other.</p> <p>Also, what effect does the processing have on the acceptability of product and patronage.</p> <p>What insinuated the choice of topic or research?</p> <p>Are there contending issues or challenges on the processes in Indonesia? The author should give a clear problem statement to that effect.</p> <p>It is fair but I suggest ' Processing and Sensory Evaluation of Dried Rebon Shrimps from Katapang Doyong Coastal Area, Pangandaran Regency'.</p> <p>The abstract is not comprehensive enough. However, if the manuscript is restructured, the abstract will automatically take shape.</p> <p>The author should endeavor to make the results clearer and separate it from the discussion for better understanding. For example, the author quoted Sirait (2019) to have said cleaning fish or shrimps when processing dried fish or shrimp is very important to get a clean product and superior quality'. Is the statement in conformity with your findings or contrary?</p> <p>The Research Methods seem ambiguous. The processing should be separated from the Sensory Evaluation.</p> <p>If above observations are taken care of. The study should also be adequately justified.</p> <p>The references are recent but not sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It could be better polished.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author should consult more literatures, justify the work, give source(s) of the Research Methods, separate results from discussions and use author guidelines as recommended by the Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research.</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alawode, Rahmatallah Adenike
Department, University & Country	Forestry Research Institute of Nigeria, Nigeria