

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_86105
Title of the Manuscript:	Perceptions of Sustainable Utilization of Coastal Resources in The Pangandaran Sub-District
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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/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>Author claims that he has collected data from 50 respondents in the methodology section. Contingency tables have been constructed to test the hypothesis about the independence of attributes between sustainability and other socio economic factors of coastal resources utilization in Pangandran district.</p> <p>Tbale-1 categorizes fifty respondents into Low(5), Medium(24) and High (21) categories based on public perception.</p> <p>But from Tabe-2 to Table-4 , where cross-tabulation is under taken between economic, social and environmental factors with that of sustainability of coastal resources, the total sample size considerably vary from Table to Table.</p> <p>Sample size for Table-2 is 79, sample size for Table-3 is 67 and sample size for Tbale-4 is 114. This needs clarification from the author, whether the author has collected only from 50 respondents are sample size vary for each factor.</p> <p>Whenever the cell frequency is below 5, one need to be cautious in applying Chi-square test. In most of tables, cell frequencies is below 5.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>NO there no ethical issues in paper.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	H.Chandrashekar
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences, India