

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_119738
Title of the Manuscript:	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STUDY OF SEAWEED HILARIZATION CASE STUDY IN LONTAR VILLAGE, TIRTAYASA DISTRICT, SERANG DISTRICT
Type of the Article	Review

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is indeed important for the scientific community, particularly within the fields of socio-economic development, sustainable agriculture, and marine resources management. By focusing on seaweed processing in Lontar Village, it addresses a niche but significant area that links community livelihoods with environmental sustainability. The detailed SWOT analysis and practical recommendations provide valuable insights that can be applied to similar coastal communities, potentially leading to improved economic outcomes and sustainable practices. Additionally, the study contributes to the body of knowledge on how local resources can be optimized to benefit small-scale processors, making it a relevant and timely addition to existing literature.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Add some more references relative to this topics</p> <p>Some more point to add</p> <p>1: This paper provides a thorough and timely examination of the declining seaweed production in Lontar Village. The use of SWOT analysis is appropriate and the detailed breakdown of internal and external factors adds depth to the research. However, the paper would benefit from more comprehensive data on the historical context of seaweed production in the village to better understand the factors leading to the current situation.</p> <p>2: The study's methodology, particularly the use of purposive sampling and the case study method, is well-explained and justified. The integration of IFAS and EFAS matrices to support the SWOT analysis strengthens the findings. Nonetheless, the paper could improve by including a section on the limitations of the study and potential biases in the data collection process.</p> <p>3: The strategic recommendations based on the W-T (Defensive) strategy are practical and actionable. The proposal for optimizing seaweed processing areas and HACCP training is well-founded. However, the paper could enhance its impact by discussing potential partnerships with local and international stakeholders to support the proposed strategies.</p> <p>4: This research effectively highlights the socio-economic challenges faced by seaweed processors in Lontar Village. The comprehensive analysis of internal and external factors provides valuable insights. A minor suggestion would be to include more recent literature to contextualize the findings within the current global trends in seaweed processing and marketing.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript makes a valuable contribution to the field and, with minor revisions, has the potential to be a significant resource for researchers and practitioners alike.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Bhuvnesh Kumar Singh
Department, University & Country	Moradabad Educational Trust Group of Institutions, India