

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_127045
Title of the Manuscript:	Development Prospects Of Smoked Fish Business In Sinjai District, South Sulawesi Province, Indonesia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 highlights on the characteristics of the fish smoking business within the study area. It brings to light information on prospects and problems that exist within the fish processing environment under study. I like the work as it will encourage business growth in the fishing business and fishing communities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is ok	
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.	Abstract should be written in a report form that is continuous in nature. The highlights of aims, study design, place and duration of study e.t.c should be removed. The several explanations of qualitative analysis is not necessary. Results stated should be explicit	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections are appropriate however, Introduction does not touch on the characteristics of smoked fish business within the study area. It also does not highlight on the significance of the study. The pattern of reporting the research should be replicated in all aspects of the article just as is suggested in the abstract	
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 paper bears good scientific prospects but lack technical appropriateness to convey its information. It is however not so scientifically robust as results were not properly discussed with related literature	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The abstract are recent but do not follow a particular edition, stick to one.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No. lots of work is required for the information therein to be appropriately communicated	
Optional/General comments	Whilst the article contains needed information, a general overhaul of the work is required for easy communication. The article should be in report form	

Review Form 3

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:	Ngozi Ihechiluru Onyeonula
Department, University & Country	Alvan Ikoju Federal University of Education, Nigeria