

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_121163
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTIVENESS AND MANAGEMENT STRATEGY OF TUAL ARCHIPELAGO FISHING PORT IN SUPPORTING MEASURED FISHING
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The Manuscript bring to bear the issue of management and policy for the sustainable use of the Blue Economy for national development. In this regard, the author leveraged on the importance of policy to guide the management of the fishing sector of Indonesia to avoid illegal and unregulated fishing. The manuscript contributes a lot to policy to ensure the effectiveness of fishing port facilities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript is suitable as the research is more of policy and management.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the manuscript is clear and well articulates the objectives, methodology and outcome of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections of the manuscript are appropriate and flow in a logical sequence.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript contributes well enough to the body of scientific knowledge. The correctness and researchability of the research is that the author did not only discussed the role and management strategy of the fishing port but also unknowingly dealt into current issue of the Blu Economy for sustainable development. The author in his research method uses very important tools to gather and analyzed data.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The number of references used for the research are sufficient and very current.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The level of English grammar used in the manuscript is very much acceptable, especially for someone who is not a native English speaker.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Robert G. M. Nyemah
Department, University & Country	Regional Maritime University, Ghana