

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123026
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationship between Scientific Management Practices Followed by Fish Farmers with their Socio-Economic Profile Characteristics
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the relationship between the socio-economic profile characteristics of fish farmers and their adoption of scientific management practices in inland fisheries. The study was conducted in Raichur district of Karnataka, India, which has significant potential for inland fisheries development. The findings highlight the importance of factors such as education, social participation, extension orientation, and mass media utilization in influencing the adoption levels of scientific practices among fish farmers. This information can help guide targeted interventions to enhance fish farming practices, thereby boosting productivity and supporting rural economies. The manuscript presents a well-designed study using an ex-post-facto research approach to analyze data from 120 fish farmers across eight villages. The researchers utilized a comprehensive scale to measure the adoption of scientific management practices, which included components such as pond preparation, feed management, weed management, and harvesting. The statistical analyses, including correlation and regression, provide a robust assessment of the relationships between socio-economic variables and adoption levels.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>This title is concise, informative, and effectively communicates the essence of the research.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive but could benefit from some adjustments to enhance clarity and focus. Here are my suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conciseness: The abstract is quite lengthy and includes excessive background information about the fisheries sector in India. It would be more effective to streamline this section by summarizing key points succinctly, focusing on the study's aims, methods, results, and implications. 2. Clear Objectives: The objectives of the study should be stated more explicitly at the beginning of the abstract. This helps readers quickly understand the purpose of the research. 3. Results Emphasis: While the results are mentioned, they could be highlighted more clearly. For instance, stating the specific percentages of adoption levels and the socio-economic factors influencing these levels in a more structured way would improve readability. 4. Implications and Recommendations: The abstract should conclude with a brief statement on the implications of the findings and any recommendations for future research or practice. This would provide a clear takeaway for readers. <p>An alternative abstract could be structured as follows: Abstract: This study investigates the relationship between the adoption of scientific management practices by fish farmers and their socio-economic profile characteristics in the Raichur district of Karnataka, India. Using an ex-post-facto research design, data were collected from 120 fish farmers across eight villages. The results indicate that 36.28% of farmers adopted scientific management practices at a medium level, while 33.72% and 30.00% reported low and high adoption levels, respectively. Key socio-economic factors influencing adoption included education, social participation, extension orientation, and mass media utilization. These findings underscore the need for targeted interventions to enhance adoption rates and improve fish farming productivity, thereby supporting rural economies. This revised abstract maintains the essential details while improving clarity and focus.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure and subsections of the manuscript appear to be generally appropriate for conveying the research findings effectively.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its well-defined research methodology and comprehensive data analysis. The use of an ex-post-facto research design is appropriate for assessing the adoption of scientific management practices among fish farmers, as it allows for the examination of existing conditions without manipulation of variables.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The manuscript includes a limited number of references, with the most recent being from 2020. While the references provide some relevant context, there are opportunities to strengthen the literature review by incorporating additional, more recent studies.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the manuscript require improvement for it to be suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Manoj Kumar Das
Department, University & Country	SRI SRI University, India