

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_127318
Manuscript Title:	Assessment of the impact of a composite fish farming training program on participants' knowledge acquisition in West Kameng district, Arunachal Pradesh
Article Type	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states just that **NO** Manuscripts should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound. To find out a complete guide to the Peer Review process, reviewers are asked to visit this link:

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

Important Policies Concerning Peer Review

Peer Review Comment 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

Must REVISION Comments	Reviewer comments	Author Input <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight the section in the manuscript. The author is obliged to write his response here)</i>
Please write a few sentences about the importance of this manuscript to the scientific community. Why did you like (or dislike) this script? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this section.	Basically, this research is still rarely carried out, but at the introductory stage the author does not explain the materials combined in carrying out the engineering. Overall, the article does not provide clear information. From the review there is nothing that makes the reader want to know more deeply about the research topic, as there is novelty in this research. The graphics presented in the article are so simple that they are less interesting	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)	Title Too long Recommendations: Impact of Training in Composite Fish Cultivation Program on participants' abilities in West Kameng District, Arunachal Pradesh	
Is the article abstract comprehensive? Would you suggest adding (or removing) some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is too short, it would be better to provide a brief introduction about composite fish cultivation, so that readers are interested in looking more deeply. It is better not to put words and other words in keywords.	
Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In accordance	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific truth of this manuscript. Why do you think this manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this section.	Combined Fish Cultivation Maybe in explaining the types of freshwater fish that can be combined in cultivation. There may be observed behavior	
Are the references sufficient and up to date? If you have additional reference suggestions, please indicate them in the review form. -	The references used are the latest references, but they are still very minimal.	
Small REVISION Comments		
Is the quality of the article in Bahasa/English suitable for scientific communication?	Language is appropriate and understandable	
Optional/General comment	In the introduction, it is best to prioritize things that explain the research topic, as well as the necessity for conducting research. The analysis used is very simple.	

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:	Eddy Silamat
Department, University & Country	Pat Petulai University, Indonesian