

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_127090
Title of the Manuscript:	Present Worker Status and the Way Forward of Constraints Associated with Dry Fish Processing in Cox's Bazar District of Bangladesh
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.	Here, the justification of the study is not clear. What is the newness of this article?	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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 research aimed to determine the conditions and issues affecting dry fish processing workers and the drying centers. Here, the results is absent in the abstract related to objectives. So rewrite the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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 sample size is 300. You mentioned that the target groups were dried dish processors, entrepreneurs, fishermen, and other employees. So please classify the sampling according to actors. In abstract you write down data was collected with Questionnaires by Semi-Structured Personal Interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDS) Of Respondents. So why you write down the following sub section in methodology? 2.4 Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) For stakeholder involvement, semi-structured survey questionnaires and focus group discussions (FGDs) as PRA tools were used. 2.5 Key Informant Interview (KPI) Primary data generated by the survey and FGD were varied with Key Informants Interviews with DFO officials, local government personnel, civil society men and NGO workers.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The language/English quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anup Kumar Mandal
Department, University & Country	Patuakhali Science and Technology University, Bangladesh