

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_119727
Title of the Manuscript:	DIVERSITY, ABUNDANCE, AND SEASONAL VARIATION OF AQUATIC MACROPHYTES IN SOUTHEASTERN BANGLADESH
Type of the Article	

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?</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. Few studies in Bangladesh on this subject.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Needs big revision. Lacks summaries of methods and results</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No. Methods are not described. Metrics (abundance per unit area surveyed) are not quantified or described.</p> <p>7. Need more references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The author did very well writing a technical article in English.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Major revision is recommended. Supporting details in the markup of the manuscript. The author appears to have surveyed several habitat types in three districts of southeastern Bangladesh. Exactly how much effort was expended surveying each habitat type in each district is not described, so metrics like abundance of species do not specify the areas surveyed, e.g., number of species per hectare per water body type. It is so qualitative that statements about relative abundance are ambiguous. It seems the author went out and identified what he/she found and reported it.</p> <p>This is a data report, and although the author suggested the information was crucial to management of aquatic macrophytes, I question whether the author had any idea what and how the authorities would use this information. For example, the author talks about aquatic macrophytes but also mentions weeds, but does not distinguish between native species, weedy species, and invasive species, nor links their presence and absence to pollution or the quality of habitat (e.g., different Degrees of disturbance).</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:	Rick D. Cardwell
Department, University & Country	USA