

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_95953
Title of the Manuscript:	Lake Guidimouni: Diversity of vertebrate fauna and its threats
Type of the 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.journaljgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. I believe these manuscripts are important for understanding the ecology of lakes and developing sustainable management approaches</p> <p>2. the title is appropriate, but please consider the use of the word "fauna" after vertebrates</p> <p>3. yes, it's comprehensive</p> <p>4. yes, There are appropriate</p> <p>5. I think it's enough</p> <p>6. The existing references are quite up-to-date</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the language/English of the articles used is quite suitable for scientific communication</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The use of the words: "salinity (or salinization?), over exploitation and invasion by species" in the abstract, results and discussion, should be based on adequate data (in quantitative or qualitative form). Example :</p> <p>1. overexploitation fish : a. number of fishermen, b. The number of fishing gear, and allows c. How many CPUE fish based on time. 2. Microplastic pollution: Presence data of the plastic waste in the lake or the type of microplastic that has polluted the lake is needed. 3. Salinity (in abstract) or salinization (in results), which contain different approaches from a management point of view. 4. Chemical pollution caused by the use of chemicals, but the information is only on the use of these materials (from photos) and is not supported by data on the area of agricultural land and the volume of use of these materials for agricultural land and only the assumption that these materials have polluted the lake. 5. Plant invasion (Typha australis and Prosopis juliflora): information on the cover area (%) of these two species is needed in the lake area.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aditya Irawan
Department, University & Country	Mulawarman University, Indonesia