

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_123162
Title of the Manuscript:	Strategies for the Development of Tilapia Fish Floss Processing Businesses: A Case Study in Cijambe Village, Cijambe Subdistrict, Subang District
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: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is of interest and meets demands regarding public policy guidance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<u>Yes</u>	
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.	<u>The abstract is well written and objective.</u>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<u>Yes</u>	
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.	<u>The authors meet the objectives. As for robustness, I think there should be an appendix (or annex) of the questions that were applied to collected the data. This makes the information studied clear and allows other authors to use and improve it.</u>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<u>Of the 20 references, 80% are recente, from the last five years including 2024.</u>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Apparently not. But it is of interest to have the consent of an ethics committee to collect the questionnaire data.	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Elvino Ferreira</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Rondônia, Brazil</b>