

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJFAR_96092</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Capture Area Compatibility with Map of Fishery Potential Area Based on Chlorophyl-A And Sea Surface Temperature in Aru Sea Waters- Indonesia</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**ART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> it is a good work, it can be useful for fishermen who want to use the method, What I find strange is that it does not mention the current state of fisheries at the global and local level.</p> <p><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> The title does not really reflect the information content of the paper, a good title should contain: the subject of study: Chlorophyl-A And Sea Surface Temperature (study variables) the subject of study: Fisherys in Aru Sea Waters Indonesia ( who and where) the method: Correlation therefore: a good title should contain these data in a logical no more than 15 words.</p> <p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> rewrite the abstract with this structure: Brief introduction, objective, methodology, results and conclusion.</p> <p><b>What is the originality of the work compared to conventional methods?</b> It is not clear, it is not mentioned in the manuscript, from the planning of the problem and your research question. <b>try to give answer to it in the abstract.</b> should be improved, the abstract should be rethought.</p> <p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> correct, but the methodology is not aligned with the international consensus, it cannot be replicated, there is not enough information, and the information you write is confusing, it is disorganized.</p> <p><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> the methodology is confusing. the order generally is: Study site Type of research Techniques and instruments and sampling. Study variables and their period of study. Statistical analysis Software used</p> <p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> there are 21 references, you should investigate more in similar works and give a little more statistics, from the global to the local about the problem of fisheries and what is the difference with your method with the current methods used by the fishing boats, you do not present information of the survey that you claim to have carried out.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>I do not feel qualified to comment in the English language.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>All figures should be included with a better resolution. the paper is quite good, but it lacks a proper methodology which the authors are urged to improve. There are several minor punctuation errors, the abstract should be improved.</p> <p>These conclusions should be improved, the word good is not enough, you can use: statistical evidence indicates that ..... with a confidence level of.... that .... is ..... therefore, the method used can be used to predict.....</p> <p>On the other hand I am not sure that sonar technology is not used to determine the presence of shoals, not only with experience, it should indicate the contrast with other scientific methods. in this section it is advisable to propose future lines of research. And the comments of the users with the survey that you made.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Erick Arturo Betanzo Torres</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mexico</b>