

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_129371
Title of the Manuscript:	Retracing Sustainable Fishing Practices of Marine Resources in the Coastal Communities of Antique
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 is significant for the scientific community as it bridges resilience theory with the practical realities of small-scale fisheries, offering a comprehensive understanding of adaptive strategies in response to ecological and social challenges. By focusing on the fishing practices of Antique's fisher folks, it provides critical insights into sustainable resource management and the preservation of marine biodiversity. The findings contribute to the growing body of literature on resilience in socio-ecological systems, emphasizing the need for robust policy frameworks that support both community livelihoods and environmental conservation. Additionally, the study highlights the importance of integrating traditional knowledge with modern approaches to address the complexities of marine resource management effectively.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The current title of the article is not provided in your message. Based on the content and focus of the manuscript, a suitable title could be:</p> <p>"Resilience and Sustainability in Small-Scale Fisheries: Adaptive Practices and Challenges in Antique, Philippines"</p> <p>This title captures the essence of the research, highlighting resilience, sustainability, and the specific geographic and thematic focus of the study. If the existing title does not align with these aspects, this alternative could be considered. Let me know if you'd like to refine it further!</p>	

Review Form 3

<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 effectively summarizes the study, but it could benefit from slight refinements for improved clarity and comprehensiveness. Below are some suggestions:</p> <p>Additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Problem Statement: Briefly mention the issue of declining fish populations and unsustainable fishing practices at the beginning of the abstract to set the stage. Key Findings: Include specific findings, such as the impact of kubkuban and lambaklad methods on overfishing and the weaknesses in law enforcement. Significance: Emphasize the relevance of the study to fisheries management, conservation efforts, and policy-making. <p>Deletions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Remove overly broad statements if they do not directly contribute to the essence of the study. For instance, if the abstract includes general observations not tied to the findings, they could be condensed or omitted. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, as it is well-grounded in resilience theory and supported by references to relevant literature and studies. The discussion effectively links the adaptive practices of fisherfolk to broader environmental and socioeconomic challenges, offering a nuanced understanding of the fishing community's dynamics.</p> <p>Key strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Use of Resilience Theory: The application of the adaptive cycle within resilience theory provides a strong theoretical framework to analyze the responses of fisherfolk to environmental and economic disturbances. Comprehensive References: The manuscript is well-supported by credible sources, including recent studies and official reports. Clear Presentation of Results: Observations regarding fishing methods, law enforcement challenges, and the impact of fishing practices on marine biodiversity are consistent with established research findings. <p>Potential areas for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Quantitative Data: If additional quantitative data on fish populations, catch volumes, or specific environmental changes were included, it would strengthen the scientific rigor. Comparative Analysis: A deeper comparative analysis of traditional versus modern fishing practices could provide further insights into their long-term sustainability. <p>Overall, the manuscript demonstrates scientific validity and contributes meaningfully to discussions on fisheries management and marine conservation.</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 references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and include a mix of recent and foundational works that support the study's claims and discussions. Many references are from the past five years, ensuring relevance to current research trends and practices in fisheries management and marine conservation</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and coherent expressions of ideas. The writing is formal and adheres to the conventions of academic research. However, there are some areas where the language could be refined to enhance clarity and precision. Here are some suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grammar and Sentence Structure: There are a few instances of long and complex sentences that could benefit from being broken down into simpler sentences for easier readability. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "Fisher folks have reported that there is a decline in fish population within municipal territories" could be revised to: "Fisher folks have reported a decline in fish populations within municipal territories." 2. Consistency in Terminology: Some terms, such as "fisher folks," "fishermen," and "fishers," are used interchangeably. It would be clearer to consistently use one term throughout the manuscript. 3. Clarity in Descriptions: In some sections, additional context or more precise terms could improve understanding. For instance, "Overfishing could lead to ecological extinction" could be revised to: "Overfishing can lead to the ecological collapse of marine species, making them critically endangered or extinct." 4. Formal Tone: The tone of the manuscript is mostly appropriate, though some sections, particularly in the discussion of challenges, could be more neutral or less conversational. For example, "they would eventually get caught but would be found within municipal waters after 2 days" could be revised to: "While violations are detected, commercial fishing vessels often re-enter municipal waters after a short period." <p>Overall, with minor revisions for clarity, consistency, and grammatical precision, the manuscript would be more polished and suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In summary, the manuscript would benefit from minor revisions to improve language clarity and consistency, but major revisions are recommended if there is a need to enhance the theoretical framework, methodology, and ethical considerations.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Mina Jamil</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Agriculture, Pakistan</p>