



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_48306
Title of the Manuscript:	Building Sustainable Communities: A Reality Check on performance of Fishermen's Cooperative Societies in Tripura, India
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:

(<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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In section 2.5.5 "Perceived weaknesses of cooperative", the formula provided for Garrett ranking is mis-typed. 2. "Fig.1 Ordinary members' participation in functional activities of their societies" shows extremely high levels of no participation across all categories. "Fig.2 Ordinary members' participation in fish seed production of their societies" also shows high levels of no participation, though not as high as Fig. 1. The difference between the 2 figures is quite significant. Perhaps the author can explain why participation in fish seed production seems a lot higher than ordinary functional activities. One can argue that maybe fish seed production affects the fishermen's livelihood much more than, say, general management. However, if that is the case, why is "no participation" in fish seed still > 50%? If we can understand the drivers behind fishermen's participation in fish seed production better, these drivers might help us improve their participation in other functional activities as well. 3. The same figures (figures 3 and 4) for the functionaries' participation are a lot more healthy. Again, if we can figure out the reasons why functionaries are more willing to participate in their society activities than the ordinary members, these reasons may help us improve the ordinary members' participation. 4. Both points 2 and 3 above can be tackled in the "conclusion" section. 5. The Garrett ranking of the weakness factors alone (Table 4) may not tell us much about the relationship between respondents' perception and the factors. The author can perhaps perform a Chi-square test between the Garrett scores and the weakness factors as in a contingency table setting. This test can determine if the null hypothesis that there is no systematic relationship between Garrett scores and weakness factors can be rejected. If the null hypothesis is not rejected, then effectively the weakness factors cannot give us any clues as to which factors significantly drive down members' participation more than the other factors. If, on the other hand, we reject the null, then we can pinpoint which factor(s) are the culprit and focus on them. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The references should provide the DOI's (digital object identifiers) whenever possible. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>The author has done a good job showing us a glimpse of the lackadaisical participation in the fishermen's cooperatives. Further statistical analysis may tell us which weakness factors to focus on to improve the situation.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Eric A.L. Li</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>The University of Hong Kong, China</i>