

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_88358
Title of the Manuscript:	Business Development Strategy for Skipjack Fish Floss
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-Need to check grammatical error and sentence structure before final submission	Yes, I've checked and improved grammar and sentence structure.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>-All variables are well described. Please write a separate paragraph about all findings of this paper. It will help to create a good understanding of overall ideas for academic researchers and concern people.</p> <p>- I personally like the way of using 4p's of Marketing Mix Strategy, SWOT analysis diagram and SWOT Matrix.</p> <p>- As researcher describe that "Skipjack tuna is the newest flavor variant that has been around since 2018 and has managed to become the best-selling product today" – this kind of information is very important for academic researchers and concern people. The significance of this topic of this journal is well described.</p> <p>- SWOT analysis diagram and SWOT Matrix are well presented.</p> <p>- This paper claimed that ETHICAL APPROVAL FROM AUTHENTIC SOURCES, WHICH IS A VERY ESSENTIAL TASK FOR THIS TYPE OF JOURNAL..</p>	Thank you for checking out the whole journal I've submitted. I worked on it as well as possible so that it became information that would later be useful for readers. This paper claimed that ethical approval from authentic sources, which is a very essential task for this type of the journal.

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>	No ethical issues.