

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. The study's methodology, results, and conclusions provide valuable information that this manuscript can contribute to the scientific community's understanding of marine species' ecology and inform sustainable fisheries management and conservation policies.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English corrections are required. Some parts of the manuscript are not fluent and difficult to read.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>If the results section is separate from the discussion, you must consider section 3 as only results (not results and discussion). Furthermore, you do not need to repeat the results in the discussion section!</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:	Seyed Ehsan Vesal
Department, University & Country	Stazione Zoologica Anton Dohrn, Italy