

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_128102
Title of the Manuscript:	A Socio-Economic Analysis on Shrimp Culture (Litopenaeus Vannamei) in Godavari Districts of Andhra Pradesh
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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study provides valuable insights into the socio-economic aspects of shrimp farming in the East and West Godavari districts of Andhra Pradesh. By analyzing factors such as costs, returns, resource use efficiency, and production constraints, it offers critical data for stakeholders aiming to enhance shrimp farming practices. The findings on input utilization and profitability can guide policy interventions and extension activities to improve sustainability and economic efficiency in shrimp aquaculture.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Socio-economic insights into shrimp farming (<i>Litopenaeus vannamei</i>) : a case study from Godavari Districts, Andhra Pradesh	
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 is comprehensive but could be improved for clarity and flow. Suggestions are <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove minor redundancies (e.g., repetition of profitability metrics). Add context to the resource use efficiency findings by briefly mentioning the most underutilized input and its implications. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound. However, there are minor methodological inconsistencies that need to be addressed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The stated use of stratified random sampling contradicts the purposive selection of mandals. This requires clarification. The seasonal dummy variable lacks clear definitions for "summer" and "winter" periods. Supporting references should be added. Under the Garrett Ranking technique, further explanation of ranking validation is recommended. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant, but including more recent studies (post-2020) on shrimp aquaculture in Andhra Pradesh or similar regions will enhance the manuscript's depth. Comparison should be made in the results and discussion section Suggestions: A map of the study area and sources providing official government recommendations for optimal stocking density is needed.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally acceptable but requires refinement for scholarly standards. The author should take care of grammatical errors, where to write a capital letter and where not.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Ensure all figures and tables have proper captions and use consistent formatting for numbers and units (e.g., "per kilogram" should consistently appear as "kg"). Other suggestions are given in the manuscript	

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:	Shahid Gul
Department, University & Country	ICAR – Central Institute of Fisheries Education, India