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| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **This manuscript has the potential to make a valuable contribution to the scientific community, particularly in the field of fisheries. In the introduction, the authors emphasize the need for a comprehensive strategy encompassing swamp habitat management, strenghening of fishermen groups, institutional development, and the advancement of efficient eel aquaculture technologies. Moreover, the stated aim of the study is to analyze the development strategy for eel export in South Kalimantan Province. However, the findings focus narrowly on trade-related strategies and are based solely on a single exporting company. The study does not include analysis of other key actors in the supply chain, such as eel fishermen and collectors/suppliers.**  |  |
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| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | **Several issues related to scientific rigor and structure need to be addressed:****1. The sub-section titled “Determining Factor Weight” is currently placed under the Results and Discussion section, whereas it should be included in the Materials and Methods section, as it describes part of the methodological process.****2. The manuscript lacks a clear explanation of how the authors conducted the identification and inventory of internal and external factors. It is not specified whether this was done through interviews, document analysis, or other data collection methods.****3. The methodology section does not sufficiently describe how the weights and ratings were assigned. It remains unclear whether the values were subjectively determined by the authors themselves or based on input from respondents through questionnaires or other means.****4. There are formatting errors in the presentation of scientific names of species. According to standard scientific writing conventions, species names should be italicized, with only the genus name capitalized (e.g., *Monopterus albus)*** |  |
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| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **The manuscript contains numerous grammatical and word choice errors that affect the clarity and readability of the text. These issues are likely due to the authors not being native English speakers. It is strongly recommended that the manuscript be reviewed by a professional proofreader or a native English-speaking colleague with experience in academic writing. Several examples:**1. **In the abstract: “The eel export strategy in South Kalimantan Province, especially Hulu Sungai Regency, is the largest eel producing area with CV. Tiga A as the sole active exporter that exports live eels to the Chinese market through a distribution chain involving catchers, collectors, suppliers, and exporters.” It contains subject–predicate mismatch, confusing phrase, and poor structure.**
2. **In the introduction: “Even the level of eel consumption is still low in the community due to cultural factors of consumption and lack of information about its nutritional benefits.” Incorrect use of “Even”, it should be “However”; “cultural factor of consumption” is awkward, it should be “cultural dietary preference”.**
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