

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.	The paper has a lot of potential for the scholarly community. But the manuscript is not designed properly. The write up is confusing. How can a paper conclude with result section? It needs to be strengthened with discussion, implication of the study and so on. The authors can also mention the limitation of the study and what else can be done in future.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Can be better. For example: Livelihood of Fisherman: A case on Pakistan	
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.	1. Please write the draft in one font size. "Times New Roman Font size 12" 2. The abstract needs clarity and spacing. The punctuation marks are missing wherever needed hence creating ambiguity. 3. "They suggested" Who suggested? Please rewrite the sentence clearly. 4. I am not very clear with the finding of the research. You should indicate the implication of the study as well. A research will either be significant or non-significant. This does not matter. How is that surprising for you and particularly for s country like Pakistan please specify that. 5. In Keywords: use COVID-19 instead of COVID19. Please maintain consistency.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No! needs improvement.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1. English structure and format needs improvement throughout the draft. 2. Work on the coherence of the draft. 3. Data and methodology section: English is not clear. The author is confused 501 respondents or 502? 4. Data and Methodology section: Which technique is used is not mentioned. 5. Is SPSS used for the analysis? 6. In Short, there is no clarity on the scientific process and I don't find this draft to be technically sound. It needs a lot of improvement	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	NO! The authors needs to work more on this	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	NO! In fact this draft needs major revision	
Optional/General comments		
	Need to rework the entire draft.	

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:	Pooja Patnaik
Department, University & Country	Jindal Institute of Behavioural Sciences, O.P. Jindal Global University, India