Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJFAR_84193**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Tree Species Diversity in a Semi-Conserved Beach Forest in Southern Philippines**
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:

(https://www.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/editorial-policy)

	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	1. Many of the data presented in the introduction do not have an adequate citation, 2. Section 1.2 the format of the writing of the objectives and following parts, is for a thesis style format, I suggest that these parts be integrated into paragraphs with appropriate writing for the article format. 3. Section 2.1 cover and extent of vegetation. A coverage analysis is usually done, using an unsupervised classification. That can be done in many software, it could be IDRISI, it can also be done in Qgis or Arcgis. The use of Google Earth, although it could be valid as a methodology, the result of these measurements are not reliable due to the high level of distortion, and therefore the resulting data lack reliability, I suggest changing the methodology. 4. Section 2.2 Why do transect 3 and 4 have three plots each and a standardized number was not used to perform the sampling? Please explain the procedure and why it was decided to put a different number of plots, this could cause overestimation of the data, and differences caused by the methodology per se and not by intrinsic differences. 5. Section 2.2.1. Only Excel was used to make the indexes? Because it is not clear if it was only used to perform the data matrices, specify if another program was used for the analyzes of the community structure. If you have only used Excel as software, I recommend the use of other programs, for example Rstudio, because spreadsheets for statistical operations have a high error rate, especially with a large amount of data and the attempt to correcting these errors will mostly lead to new errors. Currently there are numerous statistical packages for the analysis and selection of variables for the calculation of diversity indices, if I recommend the use of another statistical package. 6. Of the three dominant species in the area, the implications of these in the area are not discussed, if due to species of economic importance and high cultivation they can be subtracting diversity and monopolize the spectrum of other equally native species but without commercial use. 7. There is no discussion about the ecological implications of the type of dominant species in the region. 8. Many of the references do not appear in the text. 9. Some of the references do not seem to be related to the topic of the article. 10. Review citation 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21 11. Introduction deficient 12. Discussion deficient	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Table 3. Show as table not as image 2. For the figures, use another program to make them 3. Figure 5, complete species name 4. Citation 25 and 26 without proper citation format	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General 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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**M. en C. Jazmín Terán Martínez**
Department, University & Country	**El Colegio de la Frontera Sur, México**