

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_99511
Title of the Manuscript:	MANGROVE FOREST OF ROSWAR ISLAND, IN THE NATIONAL PARK OF CENDERAWASIH BAY, THE PROVINCE OF WEST PAPUA
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.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/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>Compulsory 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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Given the current context driven by the suppression of vegetation and consequently of natural environments, the article is relevant for the scientific community and for the preservation of natural resources and sustainable development.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>3. The abstract lacked essential elements such as the year of the study (period) plus the details of the applied methodology.</p> <p>4. As for the subsections and structure of the manuscript, for the most part, they were appropriate. However, the essential section (Conclusion) was missing.</p> <p>5. About thinking the manuscript is scientifically correct. I inform you that there are gaps and insufficient data in the Abstract, which is logically a direct result of the lack of data throughout the work. Information omitted in the Methodology, such as Period of study/year. Figure 1. should be in Medology; still, the figure, the tables were not called in the text (the author must mention it throughout the text, referencing where the results were presented). Yet, I repeat the conclusion section was neglected. Therefore, it requires changes/fixes.</p> <p>6. There are few, many references are missing due to the lack of discussion. It could still bring more updated references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes it is.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Abstract should contain more information about the methodology. And this should contain more information about the study area, period of study/year. Figure 1 should be moved to the methodology, and it should present more information about the source (Who is the author of this figure? What year is it? What software was used to make Figure 1?) As for the results, it was necessary to call the tables in the text and after each table bring the discussion with texts (studies by other authors) to corroborate or not with the data of your study. Still, the author(s) did not present a conclusion of the study. Consequently, it made a mistake and presented only Recommendations. Therefore, the work requires changes/corrections urgently to be considered an academic work.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joaci Dos Santos Cerqueira
Department, University & Country	State Secretariat for Education and Science and Technology of Paraíba, Brazil