

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEE_106150</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The type, the density, and the percentage of seagrass covers in the waters of Orwer Village, East Biak District, and Ambro-ben Village, Biak Kota District, of The Regency of Biak Numfor.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. This is only a descriptive work.</p> <p>2. The title is too long. There is no need to include in it the name of the two sampling locations. In fact, I have never seen that anywhere else.</p> <p>3. Yes, although written in poor English, full of grammatical mistakes and poor sentence structures.</p> <p>4. No. Different parts of the text are written in different fonts. Scientific names are most often not italicized. Figure 1a and 1b are actually two distinct figures. Figure 2 is imperceptible. Chart 1 and 2 are useless. Chart 3 is a Table. "Table", and not "Chart" is the correct nomenclature in scientific writing. The declarations section is lacking, including ethical statement.</p> <p>5. No. Taxonomically severely incorrect. In several parts of the text the authors call "family" as "tribes" and species as "types". The root system extends horizontally. Saying that it extends vertically is misleading. Vertically, it only extends downward from the nodes and for just a few centimetres. Upward, extend the shoots (sheat, meristem and leaves). Density alone is a poor descriptor of seagrass health as different species have widely different morphometries, thus colonizing the sea bottom with shoots of widely different sizes interspaced at widely different intervals. In fact, this conditional differentiation, and niche differentiation, is fundamental for their co-existence. This is one of the most fundamental rules of ecology. The seagrass ecological indicator is poorly explained. A and n are not explained. I also suspect it has been incorrectly applied. The sum should include both the numerator and denominator. The tables are unnecessarily complex. In several of them, the total sum (i.e., the column-wise sum shown in the bottom line) is lower than the actual sum of the values in the lines above. Replicates should not be included in the table. They are used to estimate the transect average and standard deviation. There is no statistical analysis of the results. There is no attempt to find associations between seagrass species or their relations with the environmental parameters. There is only an uninteresting, almost irrelevant description of the measured values. It would be interesting to see explained why salinity is slightly lower than the average 35 ppt.</p> <p>6. No. There are only 21 references. Several of them are of Indonesian Authorities and almost all of the remaining are of local authors publishing in local journals. The bulk literature, the core of the state-of-the-art in this topic, have been entirely neglected. Only 5 references from authors worldwide, generally being 10, 15 or even 25 years old. As an example, one of them is Odum (1998), which is not even about seagrass ecosystems but an introductory guide to general ecology ... 25 years old.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	No. The text is full of poorly structured sentences and grammatical mistakes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

## Review Form 1.7

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vasco M. N. C. S. Vieira
Department, University & Country	Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal