

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_124263
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating carbon stocks in Rhizophora mucronata planting of the PHE ONWJ REMAJA Program in Pantai Bahagia Villages, Bekasi Regency, Indonesia
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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)
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.	The manuscript include no comparison of study with other results. You have taken large sample which can be statistically analysed and significant level can be stated in this.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In title carbon stock is mentioned but in manuscript representing the carbon change in a period of 2020-2023 so need little modification of title	
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.	The abstract is quit comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	okay	
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.	The content of this manuscript is not much Scientific as it discuss only one type of measurement and calculation about the carbon stock . How diameter of seedlings are measured? The height and diameter of the seedling you are planting in the site has not been mentioned ? The manuscript hasn't represent the significance of your result statistically. The discussion part is not satisfactory	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Reference is very less. More references are required for scientific discussion	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Okay	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Subhashree Pattnayak
Department, University & Country	India