

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_128629
Title of the Manuscript:	Fisheries Research based on Experimental Fishing methods in the Coastal area of Rembang Regency, Central Java, Indonesia
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

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: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides significant insights into experimental fishing methods in the Rembang Regency, focusing on a systematic review of nine types of fishing gear from 2013 to 2022. It highlights the potential for improving fisheries technology, sustainability, and local fishery management practices. This is valuable for researchers, policymakers, and the fishing community in Central Java and beyond.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it clearly represents the manuscript's focus on fisheries research and experimental fishing methods in Rembang Regency.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and well-structured. However, it could benefit from including specific results and implications of the research, such as the most significant findings about fishing gear and experimental methods.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, presenting a systematic methodology for data selection and analysis. However, the discussion section could elaborate further on how these findings could be applied to improve fishing practices or inform future research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant and sufficient. While the manuscript includes citations from 2013 to 2022, incorporating more recent studies (e.g., post-2022) could strengthen its current relevance.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is clear and suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical edits in sections like the introduction and conclusion could enhance readability.	
Optional/General comments	The study effectively identifies experimental fishing methods and evaluates their use in Rembang Regency. Adding a section on the environmental and economic implications of these fishing methods would broaden the manuscript's impact.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bimbisar Dayanand Waghmare
Department, University & Country	Netaji Subhashchandra Bose Arts, Commerce & Science College, India