

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_121349
Title of the Manuscript:	Coastal Environment Profile (CEP) Presentation and Training-Workshop for Barangay Mana, Malita, Davao Occidental, Philippines: Engaging Stakeholders and Establishing a Community-Based Mangrove Nursery
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Yes it is quite scientific and has good societal impact	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes quite appropriate	
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.	Yes very comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes its upto the mark	
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.	Yes it is scientifically sound. More research can be made on the topic to upgrade the efficacy of the current project work.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes very much suitable	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Yes very lucid	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Use of AI graphs, Forecast models, Tables and figures need to be more added	

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Sufia Zaman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Techno India University, India</b>