

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_94283
Title of the Manuscript:	Species richness, diversity and distribution of phytoplankton in fertilised ponds of the western highlands agro-ecological zone of Cameroon
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.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>It is interesting study and will give a significant contribution in phytoplankton and ecology field, however there are several parts that need to be improved as I explained in detail below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abstract → the aim of study is not too clear and have to be consistent with the results, discussion and conclusion</li> <li>2. Introduction → Lack of updated references to support your background of study, state of the art was not well developed and need to be improved and the novelty of your study was not mentioned clearly.</li> <li>3. Materials and Methods → The map of study sites have to be provided not enough with GPS location/points. The equipment that you used in this study have to be mentioned clearly and how did you preserved your phytoplankton samples?</li> <li>4. Results and discussion → results have been presented clear enough, however the quality of graphs are needed to be improve. Authors have to make a concise and clear graph. Graphs also have to have error bar. Authors have found a very interesting findings; however some finding has not yet discussed clearly, and most references to support your finding is out of date. This part is required to be improved.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are so many grammatical errors. Results have to be used a past tense</li> <li>2. This manuscript need to be proof read by professional language editors because there are so many grammatical error and that was not use scientifically terms.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Authors have an interesting finding of their study, however this manuscript need to be improved and has a major revision	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nita Rukminasari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia</b>