

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_122650
Title of the Manuscript:	Study Bioecological of Banggai Cardinalfish in the Sea Waters of Banggai Laut Regency, Indonesia
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>The investigation of <i>Pterapogon kauderni</i> density in four distinct sampling sites of Banggai Laut Regency brings important contributions to the continuity of conservation assessments regarding this endangered species. The use of non-invasive methods of assessment, as the belt transect method, is suitable and it respects the species' conservation fragility.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Bioecological Study of Banggai Cardinalfish (<i>Pterapogon kauderni</i> Koumans 1933) in the Sea Waters of Banggai Laut Regency, Indonesia</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>There are some grammar adjustments to make. It is important to cite more details about the assessment of the biota associated (method). It needs a conclusion, that must be worked out in the whole document and brought here. Other suggestions and compulsory changes were pointed out in the reviewed manuscript file that follows this review form.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The decision to present results and discussion at the same section can, sometimes, difficult the writing. The organization and presentation of ideas (hypothesis) was impaired. As an example, there is discussion content about biota associated with <i>P. kauderni</i> brought before the results concerning this particular subject. Suggestion: Unify the sections "2.2 Tools and Materials" and "2.3 Research Methods", name it "SAMPLING", then exclude the table 1 and present its content in full sentences.</p>	
<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>The investigation was based on suitable established methods and the results can be useful in comparisons with previous and future investigations. Although, there are several adjustments to be done to make the manuscript valid (i.e free from doubts in the methodological design). Several comments were pointed out in the reviewed manuscript file that follows this review form.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>There are some references missing and the text can be improved in terms of discussing the results with data and findings, available in the literature (and already used), about <i>Pterapogon kauderni</i>. I was not able to find the reference 13, which is associated with the belt transect method. Maybe it is in Malaysian. When a reference is hard to access and/or it is in other language except English it can be characterized as "grey literature" (barrier of how it was published or a language barrier). In this sense, it is important to prioritize references that it will be accessible to the majority of the scientific community. There are some particularities that require the use of a specific reference, even if it fits as grey literature. However, in the case of reference 13, there is available literature that could replace it. Furthermore, I recommend the review and application of these observations throughout all references.</p> <p>Some papers by the DOI or link to improve the manuscript: 1) https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1755-1315/1137/1/012059/meta 2) https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.182v1 3) https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360937495_Systematic_review_of_research_trends_on_the_endemic_fish_Pterapogon_kauderni 4) https://doi.org/10.14710/IK.IJMS.26.3.165-172 (not essential, but can produce some insights to improve introduction and conclusion) 5) https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1134/1/012009 6) https://doi.org/10.13170/depik.10.3.23501</p>	

Review Form 3

	7) https://doi.org/10.3750/AIP2013.43.3.08 8) https://www.grocentre.is/static/gro/publication/295/document/kam12prf.pdf 9) https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013884020258	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No. There are several issues to be solved considering text coherence and cohesion. Some of these issues were pointed out in the reviewed manuscript file sent.	
Optional/General comments	Review the formatting of the manuscript. Also, it is necessary to correct verbal time throughout the document. Rewrite the Figures' captions, they should be standalone (descriptive enough to be understood without having to refer to the main text). The formula was not translated to English.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gianfranco Ceni
Department, University & Country	Universidade do Extremo Sul Catarinense, Brazil