

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_112395
Title of the Manuscript:	Communing Marine Fishing Community on the South Odisha Coast
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This research is less attractive to the scientific community, because the abstract description seems to provide information that is intended to accuse a certain group of Telugu Noliya of causing various problems in the environment of other fishermen, both economically, politically and socially. So with the results of this research, it is hoped that it will be able to expel this particular group of Telugu Noliya. 2. The title has no marketing value, meaning it does not arouse the reader's interest enough to want to read it to the end. The alternative title is "Socio-Economic Challenges Faced by Telugu Noliya Fisher's Communities along the South Odisha Coast: A Comprehensive Analysis." 3. The abstract does not meet the requirements for scientific writing, because the description which includes: 1) Urgency of the research, 2) Problem formulation, 3) Research objectives, 4) Research methods, 5) Research results in the form of theories, models or methods, 6) Impact of research results. Abstracts are written in single space, maximum 150-200 words 4. The structure of the text does not meet the requirements for scientific writing, it is best to adapt it to the following structure: 1) Title, 2) Abstract, 3) Introduction, 3) Literature Review, 4) Methodology, Results, 5) Discussion, 6) Conclusion, 7) References. 5. Research manuscripts have not been presented in a good and correct way as scientific works are presented, because they are still not systematic. 6. References are still very inadequate, both for contemporary references and citations that form the basis of written material. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	There are still many ways to write English grammar for scientific papers that do not meet good and correct rules.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The writing of this research manuscript should be revised first according to the structure and systematics of writing a good and correct scientific work, so that later we can easily direct it to improve the quality of the writing of the research 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Denny Arbahri
Department, University & Country	Indonesia