

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_80970
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Consumer Preferences in Selecting Processed Fish Products (Case Study in Bendungan Hilir Market, Central Jakarta, Indonesia)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>It is interesting study and will give a significant contribution in fisheries product preference in the community, however there are several parts that need to be improved as I explained in detail below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title is not too clear and confusing, need to be revised 2. Abstract → abstract is not too clear enough, the aim of study has to be mentioned clearly. The conclusion of study has to be briefly stated at the end of abstract 3. Introduction → the references that been used quite up to dated, state of the art was well developed, but still need to be improved and add more previous research/studies relate to yours and the novelty of your study was not mentioned clearly. 4. Material and method → the methods were explained clearly 5. Results and discussion → results have been presented clear enough, however the quality of graphs is needed to be improve. Authors have found a very interesting finding, however some finding has not yet discussed clearly, for example, analysis of PFV forecast has not yet been discussed and no references to support the finding. 6. Conclusion → conclusion is too long, need to be brief and concise. 7. The references were out of date 8. Lack of references in this manuscript 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The citation style that used on this manuscript was not consistent 2. This manuscript needs to be proof read by professional language editing because there are massive grammatical errors and that was not use scientifically terms. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>Authors have an interesting finding of their study; however this manuscript need to be improved and has a serious major revision</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nita Rukminasari
Department, University & Country	Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia