

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_119010
Title of the Manuscript:	Distribution, population structure, and fishery potential of the golden deep-sea crab, Chaceon somaliensis in the Kenyan Coast in East Africa
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy>)

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? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. It is if the author can bring out the objs of the study instead of person interest. Fig 1 does not capture the year of this study (2024). I suggest it should be included or you remove the figure</p> <p>2. Suggested title: population Distribution structure and fishery potential of the golden deep-sea crab, Chaceon somaliensis in the Kenyan Coast in East Africa</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. The objectives of the study was not captured, so include your results/findings as part of the objs.</p> <p>4. yes</p> <p>5. yes if all necessary corrections are made</p> <p>6. use 10 years or less than 10 years gap for the reference. Too many references in the introduction, hence reduce it.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author should use the reviewer's comments on the form to work on the original manuscript. Any figure or graph or table that was not produce from the study should be removed. Write in full all the abbreviations in the work.</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:	Christiana Nkutura
Department, University & Country	Rivers State University, Nigeria