

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Geographical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJGR_112993 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Assessment of Seagrass Ecosystems' Goods and Services of India |
| Type of the Article | Policy Article |

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This paper discusses an interesting method of quantifying the goods and services provided by seagrass beds, which may apply to other locations around the world. However, the manuscript is not well written and structured, with basic errors, and does not follow the journal's standards. 2. Yes, the title fits with the content of the work. 3. The abstract needs to be modified. This one addresses a lot about the importance of seagrasses and needs more content on why this work is important, how the method used to quantify seagrass goods and services was implemented, and it lacks a concluding sentence at the end. 4. According to the journal's guidelines, policy papers should be 3000-4000 words in length and a maximum of 3-4 figures and/or tables. However, the present paper exceeds 7000 words and presents more than 4 tables. Therefore, a major modification of the manuscript should be made according to the journal policies. 5. The content of the manuscript is scientifically acceptable but in its current state it cannot be accepted 6. This is a recent reference that could be useful for the manuscript: do Amaral Camara Lima, M., Bergamo, T.F., Ward, R.D. et al. A review of seagrass ecosystem services: providing nature-based solutions for a changing world. <i>Hydrobiologia</i> 850, 2655–2670 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-023-05244-0 <p>Comments: -Please, the names of the species are in italics. Modified in all the manuscript. - There are misspelled names of seagrass species. - The manuscript needs better use of punctuation marks and paragraph structure. - The legend of the tables should be improved, they are not well understood.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <p>Writing should be improved throughout the manuscript, as well as the use of punctuation marks and paragraph structure.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>The manuscript needs major modifications. It must be modified to the journal's standards and its structure and writing do not meet quality standards (please read the journal guidelines for authors)</p> | |

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Eduardo Gabriel Torres Conde |
| Department, University & Country | Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México |