

Review Form2

Book Name:	Science and Technology - Recent Updates and Future Prospects
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2017
Title of the Manuscript:	Implications for the Livelihood of Fisherman in the Case of Pakistan
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides important insights into the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the livelihoods of workers in the informal sector, specifically focusing on the fishing industry in Pakistan. It addresses a relevant and under-documented topic, as the informal sector is often overlooked in economic analyses, despite playing a crucial role in many developing countries. The study offers in-depth primary data on the challenges faced by these workers, identifying the most affected groups and the most effective support measures. These findings can guide policymakers in designing aid programs tailored to this vulnerable sector. Furthermore, the analysis of the connections between education, dependency, and access to government assistance sheds light on structural inequalities within the fishing industry, which deserve further exploration. Overall, this manuscript makes a substantial contribution to understanding the impact of the health crisis on the livelihoods of marginalized populations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is concise, descriptive, and well reflects the content of the study. It is appropriate and summarizes well the main elements covered in the study.	

[Review Form2](#)

Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Overall, the abstract provides a comprehensive and concise presentation of the main elements of this study. However, we could consider some minor additions to strengthen the understanding of the abstract: • Add one or two additional sentences to describe in a little more detail the nature of the primary data collected (e.g. socio-economic characteristics of respondents, geographical areas covered, etc.). • Include a sentence briefly summarizing the main conclusions of the study on the determinants of access to government assistance. • Explicitly mention that the study aims to inform policy makers on the measures to take to support this vulnerable sector. These additions would further strengthen the overall understanding of the objectives, methodology and main results of this study in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Overall, the structure and subsections of the manuscript seem very well designed to coherently and thoroughly present the different aspects of this study on the impact of the pandemic on fishermen in Pakistan	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	analysis of the manuscript, I can affirm that this study is scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons: ○ Firstly, the employed methodology is rigorous and transparent. Conducting face-to-face surveys with a representative sample of 501 fishermen allows for the collection of high-quality primary data, providing a solid empirical foundation for the analysis. Additionally, the sampling procedure and respondent characteristics are clearly detailed, enhancing the study's reliability and reproducibility. ○ Secondly, the statistical analyses performed, including significance tests and regressions, are appropriate and well-executed. The results are presented in a structured and transparent manner, facilitating peer validation and comprehension. The interpretation of the results is grounded in a thorough literature review, demonstrating a strong grasp of the academic context on the subject. • Lastly, the authors exhibit great rigor in discussing the results and formulating recommendations. They clearly identify the study's limitations and highlight future research directions, reflecting an honest and responsible scientific approach. Overall, this manuscript exemplifies high-quality research, firmly anchored in the best methodological practices.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are also very up to date, with a majority of articles published in the last 5 years. This demonstrates a thorough literature review and a good understanding of the latest developments on the subject. Some additional references that the authors could consider adding: One or two recent studies on the impact of COVID-19 on other key economic sectors in Pakistan, to better provide the overall context. A more recent report from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) on the challenges of the fisheries sector in developing countries. add references to the blue economy and mainly to the fishing sector and also during the covid 19 period	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the quality of the language and English used in this manuscript is entirely suitable for a high-level scientific publication.	
Optional/General comments	Recommendations for Improving the Article Strengthening the Literature Review - Integrate more theories and comparative studies in order to clearly situate the contribution of the study in the existing context. Deepening Data Analysis - Use more advanced data analysis techniques to strengthen the credibility of the results. Clarification and Development of the Discussion - Broaden the discussion of the results by relating them to previous work and proposing concrete political implications. Improved Presentation - Review the structure of the article for better fluidity and coherence, and correct linguistic errors. Discussion of Theoretical Implications - Deepen the discussion part to better connect the empirical results to existing theories and models in the academic literature. - Carry out a more in-depth analysis of the conceptual contributions of this study in order to strengthen its contribution on a theoretical level. More Specific Policy Recommendations - Although the recommendations made are relevant, they could be further supported and accompanied by more concrete indications for their implementation. - A more detailed discussion of potential obstacles and specific levers of action would strengthen the applicability of the recommendations. Future Research Perspectives - Develop the section on avenues for future research more substantially. - Provide more precise suggestions on the themes, methods or populations to study to usefully complete the scope of this study.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bardaa Med Amin
Department, University & Country	University of Sfax, Tunisia