

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 (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>I appreciate the emphasis on the strengths and weaknesses in seagrass research in Indonesia. However, it is necessary to further develop the solutions to the problems identified as gaps and opportunities in the discussion.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>I would shorten it a bit more by suggesting "Bibliometric Analysis and Ecological Challenges in the Era of Climate Change for Seagrass Conservation Research in 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>I would emphasize the solutions to the dynamics of the research conducted during this period.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</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 is of interest and contains solid information; however, a deeper analysis of the research results is needed. The graphs are described, but it is necessary to highlight the reasons why the dynamics moved in that direction.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I would also suggest analyzing the partnerships and collaborations between authors in more depth. As for the solutions, I would propose mentioning how the linkage between the tourism and scientific sectors should be implemented as a solution to the gap identified at the local level.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Iliana Perez Espinosa
Department, University & Country	Mexico