



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_33240
Title of the Manuscript:	Traditional Fish traps and indigenous fishing devices of North Malabar region of Kerala
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	There is some sentences in the introduction, that need citations (Mark in the PDF file). It is not clear why the authors use three names for <i>Chemballikoodu</i>, <i>Chempallykoodu</i>, <i>Chemballikudu</i>. This makes the reading complicated, and need to be revised. There are two descriptions of materials and dimension, if this mean that are different types of traps, make it more clear. The picture and the description of the <i>ChemeenKori</i>, is confuse, why three person is need to fish with these method. In some cases, economic information of cost and how much the fish cost are given, this information is very useful in this types of works, i suggest that this must be carried out. Because can be use in the conclusion section.	Citations have been duly inserted and corrected. The author has corrected the name of Chemballikoodu and she has retained this spelling throughout the revised paper. It is only one of its kind. This no confusion in the description of Chemeenkori and the author has described clearly why three men are required for the operation. The information has been collected by face to face interview with the fishermen in the field. The paper deals with the documentation of traditional fish trap devices which are made with simple, inexpensive, locally available materials and practices handed down generations from their forefathers times.
Minor REVISION comments	I think the first time that Panchayaths is used in the work, the authors must explain what is a Panchayaths.	The word Panchayath has been described in the revised version of the paper.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The bibliography is not correct, must follow the numbers by appearance not the alphabet. And the numbers of the bibliography must be in the other side of the point. There are some words that are all together in the pdf version of the manuscript. (interms of returns biomass per unit of fuel) Ethical issues: The only ethical issue, that I found is that the pictures use in the work include people, in many countries this types of pictures need the written acceptance to be in it, of the person in the picture.	Bibliography has been corrected and represented as per the guideline of the journal. These words have been corrected. The data/information has been collected with the due consent of the fishermen involved. Only if the journal insists on a written consent it need be given otherwise it's optional for the author to decide in her discretion.