## Review Form 3

| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | **Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_AJFAR_126639** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Analysis of the Abundance, Diversity, and Dominance of Plankton on the Siddo Coast, Barru Regency, Indonesia** |
| Type of the Article | |

## Review Form 3

**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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **The sentence structure requires further refinement for more clarity. Also, the Introduction is quite lengthy, with some repetitive and redundant information that could be streamlined. The study/sampling period is also quite short. In ecological research, a minimum duration of one year sampling is generally recommended.** | |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?<br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The present title is not good enough, can rephrase as,<br><br>"Analysis of Plankton Abundance, Diversity, and Dominance along the Siddo Coast in Barru Regency, Indonesia"** | |
| **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.** | **The sentence structure is weak and requires significant reframing of the sentence. Also, a non-English sentence appears within the text, which should be addressed.** | |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | **Okay** | |
| **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.** | **The manuscript requires major improvement across multiple areas. The sentence structure is and the English language usage is weak. Furthermore, the data interpretation lacks depth and coherence, making it difficult to follow. The sections on results, discussion, and conclusion also require major revisions to effectively convey the study's findings. I recommend a thorough revision focusing on language refinement, data analysis, and clearer presentation of results and conclusions to improve the overall quality of the paper. In results and discussion, it is mostly about referring to others works.** | |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.<br>-** | **Okay** | |
| Minor REVISION comments<br><br>**Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | Need major reframing of the sentences | |
| **Optional/General** comments | Usage of English language need to improve | |

## Review Form 3

**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: | **Kensibo Pamai** |
| Department, University & Country | **Patkai Christian College, Nagaland University, India** |