

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_124054
Title of the Manuscript:	Dynamics of Seagrass Conservation Research in Indonesia: A Bibliometric Analysis and Ecological Challenges in the Era of Climate Change
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<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>This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it provides a bibliometric analysis of seagrass conservation research. Despite the critical ecological and socio-economic roles seagrasses play, there is still much to explore. This study offers valuable insights that can guide future research efforts and inform conservation strategies by identifying key trends, gaps, and emerging challenges, particularly climate change. Furthermore, the findings will support evidence-based decision-making, crucial for enhancing the protection and management of seagrass ecosystems globally.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title can be improved for clarity and focus. The phrase "Dynamics of Seagrass Conservation Research" may be too broad, and combining bibliometric analysis with ecological challenges in one title can overload it. Thus, the suggested alternative title: "Seagrass Conservation Research in Indonesia: A Bibliometric Analysis of Trends and Ecological Challenges Amidst Climate Change."</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>The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the background, methods, and key findings but needs more precise articulation of the research rationale and the specific gap it addresses. An effective abstract should convey the research's motivation and unique contribution to the field. Additionally, it should highlight the necessity of this bibliometric analysis and explain how addressing this gap can enhance conservation efforts or inform policy-making in Indonesia.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>As long as the author follows the journal's requirements for subsections and manuscript structure, then it is acceptable.</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 manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness for several reasons. First, it employs bibliometric analysis, a well-established quantitative method for examining large datasets, to reveal trends and gaps in seagrass conservation research in Indonesia, thus providing a solid methodological foundation. The data collection is comprehensive, utilizing the Scopus database, recognized for its extensive indexing of academic publications. Furthermore, the manuscript employs analytical tools such as R software and VOSviewer to visualize research trends, ensuring the results are data-driven and effectively presented. These factors significantly contribute to the manuscript's scientific rigor and technical accuracy.</p> <p>However, while the methodology is generally sound, several areas could benefit from clarification to further strengthen scientific rigor:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author should not only justify the choice of Scopus as the sole database but also discuss its potential limitations and the appropriateness of this decision for the study. 2. Additional details on the selection of keywords are necessary, along with confirmation that they were validated against common seagrass conservation terminologies to ensure all relevant studies are captured. 3. The rationale for selecting the timeframe of 2007 to 2024 should be justified, along with an explanation of how this period encapsulates critical developments in seagrass conservation research. <p>Additionally, the author must acknowledge that excluding non-English papers may lead to the omission of significant regional research, particularly given the focus on Indonesia, where relevant studies may be published in Bahasa Indonesia. This represents a potential limitation, and the implications of this exclusion require discussion. Lastly, more detail on the exclusion criteria and the steps taken to mitigate the impact of excluding incomplete articles should be provided.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>As long as the author follows the journal's requirements for subsections and manuscript structure, then it is acceptable.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall, the article's language quality appears suitable for scholarly communications. However, some areas could be improved for enhanced clarity and professionalism.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct a thorough proofreading to address minor grammatical and punctuation issues, paying particular attention to sentence structure and verb tense consistency. 2. Review and standardize the citation format throughout the document, ensuring adherence to a specific style guide (e.g., APA, MLA, or the journal's preferred format). 3. Ensure consistent capitalization, formatting, and numbering across all sections, including headings, subheadings, and lists. 4. Refine sentences for improved clarity and conciseness, particularly in the methodology and results sections. Consider breaking down complex sentences into shorter, more digestible ones. 5. Double-check the formatting of tables, figures, and their captions for consistency. Ensure that all visual elements are appropriately labeled and referenced in the text. 6. Revise word choices to maintain a consistent formal tone suitable for academic publishing. Replace colloquial expressions with more scholarly alternatives where necessary. 7. Standardize technical terms and acronyms, providing definitions upon first use. 8. Review the abstract to ensure it accurately summarizes the critical points of the study, including methods, results, addressed gaps, and conclusions. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author should explicitly state how their bibliometric analysis fills existing gaps in the literature, particularly in terms of time coverage and thematic breadth. This would enhance the readers' understanding of the study's significance. • In the results section, while trends in publication (unfortunately not with their citation) are presented, there is a need for a deeper analysis of what these trends imply for seagrass conservation. The author should connect these trends to broader ecological and conservation contexts to provide insights into their implications. For example, discussing how increased publications relate to global seagrass conservation efforts would strengthen the analysis. • The discussion section should better connect the results to practical implications for seagrass conservation and future research directions. Clarifying how the findings might influence policy or practice would add value to the paper. • While the current conclusion provides a comprehensive summary of the study, it could be strengthened by emphasizing the essential findings and their significance in a more structured and focused manner. Additionally, offering clear takeaway messages and actionable steps would make the conclusion more impactful for researchers and practitioners. 	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Amar Maruf</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Universitas Halu Oleo, Indonesia</p>