

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_96092
Title of the Manuscript:	Capture Area Compatibility with Map of Fishery Potential Area Based on Chlorophyll-A And Sea Surface Temperature in Aru Sea Waters- Indonesia
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> )

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript presents relevant information, it proves that exists an influence of chlorophyll-a and sea surface temperature simultaneously and partially on the catch by giving an influence of 73.6%, which is of great relevance in this field.</p> <p>The title is appropriate according to the manuscript presented, the summary is clear, although it should be more concise with the importance of its results,</p> <p>The sections and structure of the presented article are correct, as well as the adequate references, being a scientifically correct manuscript</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>Small details that don't affect her correct comprehension</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The study carried out presents clear innovations within its respective scope. I consider that more emphasis should be placed on the innovation of this research and its importance, which is directly related to its direct application in fisheries.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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>Marcos Hernández López</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Technological Institute of Mexico, Mexico</b>