

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	

[Review Form 3](#)

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript addresses a crucial gap in the study of microplastics (MPs) in tropical estuarine environments, particularly in Africa, where research is limited. Understanding seasonal variations in MP pollution can help develop targeted strategies to mitigate plastic waste impacts on marine ecosystems. The study's comprehensive twelve-month data collection provides valuable insights into how seasonal factors influence MP distribution. However, the abstract could be improved by including more details on the methodology or statistical techniques used for result validation.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title, "Seasonal Variations of Microplastics in River Sabaki Estuary Surface Waters in Kenya," is generally suitable as it reflects the main focus of the study, which is to analyze the seasonal changes in microplastic (MP) concentrations in the surface waters of the Sabaki estuary. However, the title could be made more precise by including the aspect of "abundance and types" since the study also discusses MP types, sizes, and polymer compositions. An alternative title could be:</p> <p>Suggested Title: "Seasonal Abundance and Types of Microplastics in Surface Waters of River Sabaki Estuary, Kenya."</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is fairly comprehensive and effectively summarizes the main findings of the study. However, it could be improved by addressing the following points:</p> <p>Methodology Addition: It would be beneficial to briefly mention the sampling method or techniques used for collecting and analyzing the microplastics (e.g., "surface water sampling using XYZ method" or "MP identification using FTIR spectroscopy"). This adds clarity on how the results were obtained.</p> <p>Results Clarification: The abstract states that the April-June (A-J) season had the highest MP concentration but does not provide the possible reasons behind this increase. Including a sentence explaining why MPs are higher during this season (e.g., due to rainfall runoff) could provide a better context.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The paper is well-organized, with clear divisions for the abstract, introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. However, there are a few sections where clarification is needed for better alignment. For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Methodology (Water Sampling) section, the line "A total of 1,574 MPs particles were extracted from surface waters" seems more suitable for the Results section since it highlights the study's findings. This should be relocated to the Results section as it presents data rather than a description of the sampling process. Additionally, in the Study Area section, more clarity is needed regarding the sampling points. It would be helpful if the authors could elaborate on the selection of sampling locations. For example, did the study cover the entire estuary area or were specific points selected using a particular method? Providing details on how sampling sites were chosen would enhance the comprehensiveness of this section. 	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The study uses a comprehensive twelve-month sampling approach to assess microplastic (MP) pollution in the Sabaki River estuary, providing valuable data on seasonal variations in MP abundance, types, sizes, and polymer compositions. The inclusion of statistical analysis to determine significant seasonal differences enhances the scientific validity of the findings. Additionally, the use of FTIR analysis for polymer identification strengthens the technical accuracy of the results. However, moving certain findings from the Methodology to the Results section, as suggested, would improve the clarity and logical flow of the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references are generally sufficient and include a mix of recent studies and foundational works relevant to microplastic pollution. However, incorporating a few more recent studies from 2023-2024 on microplastic pollution in tropical estuaries could enhance the manuscript's relevance and context. This may include references like recent works on microplastic sources and seasonal variations in similar environments.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are a few minor grammatical issues and typographical errors that could be polished to improve clarity. Proofreading for consistency in terminology (e.g., "micro-plastics" vs. "microplastics") and sentence structure would enhance readability</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>This manuscript contributes valuable insights into the under-researched area of microplastic pollution in tropical estuarine environments in Africa. The findings can inform policymakers and conservation efforts in Kenya and similar regions. The detailed analysis of seasonal variations and polymer types provides a strong foundation for further research on the impacts of microplastics in marine ecosystems.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment <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></p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Roksana Parvin</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>KUET, Bangladesh</p>