

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_112330
Title of the Manuscript:	Current state and future potential of fisheries in the Mirsarai coastal areas of Chattogram for enhancing Bangladesh's blue economy
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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the present manuscript could be very much helpful for the scientific community especially for the fisheries economists and policy makers in Bangladesh. However, this paper seems much as a review paper than the research article. I suggest to make it a review paper and provide more substantial data as pointed out in manuscript.</p> <p>2. The article seems ok, but it must reflect that this paper is basically a review paper.</p> <p>3. Abstract is good but may be further refined by following the comments provided. As this manuscript can be considered as a review article rather than the research article, the format of abstract suitable for review article would be more suitable.</p> <p>4. The introduction section seems too long and reflects some portions showing results. Please go through the introduction section once again to make it short (max. 2 pages). Similarly, the methodology section needs to revised as many things written in the methodology section is not reflected by the results.</p> <p>5. Yes, but mainly for the social and economic sciences.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language needs to be revised. The sentence structure needs to revised at many instances in the manuscript. A number of sentences are found to start with phrases which make them much more confusing. Thus, making simpler sentences can be preferable for better understanding of the paper. I would suggest to get it revised by a native English speaker.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript lacks any information from the primary data source. Thus, I would suggest to provide the data from primary source as the survey was carried year around. If the primary data are not in shape to be presented, the manuscript can be accepted only as a review article rather than research article.</p>	

### 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>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rahul Ranjan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Agriculture and Forestry University, Nepal</b>