

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_102003
Title of the Manuscript:	AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF PRODUCTION OF MAGUR HATCHERIES IN BANKURA DISTRICT OF WEST BENGAL
Type of the 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> )

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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1.Case studies focus more on concrete details. They aim to exemplify, expand and challenge existing knowledge. Thus, the present manuscript holds good for scientific community. 2. Title could be more fascinating such as : “ <b>ANALYSIS OF MAGUR HATCHERIES IN WEST BENGAL</b> ” or “ <b>A CASE STUDY OF MAGUR HATCHERIES IN WEST BENGAL</b> ” 3.The abstract consists of 144 words with 6 key words. It should have been better to present <b>introduction, objectives, methodology, findings and conclusions</b> of the study. 4.Two objectives were documented and it is mentioned as <b>OBJECTIVE</b> . Mostly in case studies objectives are followed by <b>RESEARCH QUESTIONS</b> . Methodology part is good. However, findings should have been stated separately. 5.Some space for ' <b>Review of Related Research</b> ' should have been provided. <b>Implications</b> of the study were not reported. A line on suggestions for further research would add colour to your presentation. 6.The references cited are completely obsolete. APA style is widely used in research. They are cited alphabetically (serially) and publishers or journal is also out of sight. This reference “ <b>M., et al (2015) Advances in seed production and nursery rearing of economically important fish species Karthik</b> ” found to be inappropriate and incomplete.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	While interpreting data, try to present language in a scholarly manner. Instead of 'the Study examined' pl state it as ' <b>It can be deduced/inferred from the table</b> '. 	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Handbook Fisheries Statistics – 2023 , Govt. of India should have been cited as: <b>GOI (2023) Handbook Fisheries Statistics. Retrieved from</b> <b><a href="https://dof.gov.in/index.php/fisheries-statistics">https://dof.gov.in/index.php/fisheries-statistics</a>.</b>	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Comment [DB1]:

Review Form 1.7

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	N. Samuel Babu
Department, University & Country	ST. Joseph's PG College, Osmania University, India