

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_126893
Title of the Manuscript:	Seasonal Variations of Microplastics in River Sabaki Estuary Surface Waters in Kenya
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is interesting in how specifically analysing the distribution and properties of microplastic that can inform targeted inventions. Particularly in the context of River Sabaki expressed increasing microplastic pollution due to negative impact on the river's health. This is crucial for developing targeted strategies to reduce microplastic contamination. Not only liked for its potential to advance ecological science but also its critical implication in crafting policies to protect freshwater ecosystem and public health.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable, but it can be more eye-catching. Here I suggest the title : Seasons of Plastic : Uncovering Microplastic Trends in the River Sabaki Estuary, Kenya	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	I can suggest for adding contextual background (brief statement enlightened microplastic is a critical issue) (the clear state of the objective of the study) and simplify the results only input the most finding	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Take a look on section 4. Little bit inconsistent	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	At the statistical analysis ensure that specify the statistical tests used to validate. And mention any quality control measures that implemented to prevent contamination. This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically strong due to its comprehensive. The use of statistically significant data ($P \leq 0.05$) to differentiate microplastic concentration through different seasons enhances the reliability of the findings. The detailed analysis of microplastic size, type, polymer composition characterized of pollution dynamics. In addition, the study addresses a critical gap in African estuarine ecosystems, contributing meaningful data that can inform future environmental policies and management strategies	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It must be at least 50's references to make it legit	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	This manuscript is easy to read, but less eye-catching in communication	
Optinal/General comments	Correction for figure 3, the diagram and the legends (5%,5%,4%) should be attached appropriately, the black side is disguised.	

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:	Laras Finesha Melania
Department, University & Country	Diponegoro University, Indonesia