

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_123646
Title of the Manuscript:	Recruitment index as a new approach to assessing the resilience of natural mangrove ecosystems: A case study in the coastal of West Muna Regency
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><input type="checkbox"/> The study provides valuable insights into the resilience of mangrove ecosystems, which is critical for understanding their ability to recover under environmental stress.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The use of a recruitment index (RI) offers a robust and scientific approach to quantify resilience, making the findings reliable and data-driven.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The research contributes to conservation efforts by identifying species with high resilience, which can help prioritize protection and restoration strategies for vulnerable coastal ecosystems.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Two changes need to be; <input type="checkbox"/> "A new approach" changed to "A novel approach" for a more formal tone.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> "In the coastal of West Muna Regency" changed to "on the coast of West Muna Regency" for correct phrasing.</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 objective of the study is clearly stated. However, the term "recruitment index" might benefit from a brief explanation earlier in the abstract, as readers unfamiliar with the concept may need more context.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Need to improve in Results and discussion section;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity and Focus: The presentation of mangrove density data is quite detailed but could benefit from being more concise. The narrative could focus on key trends and insights rather than listing every station's specific value, which might be overwhelming to the reader. Summarizing major findings while keeping the details in tables would improve the readability of the section. Explanation of Recruitment Index (RI): While the recruitment index is well-described, it would be useful to expand on the ecological or biological significance of the specific RI values for readers unfamiliar with the index. For example, what exactly does an RI of 1.25 mean in ecological terms, and how does it compare to other ecosystems? Deeper Analysis of Mangrove Species: While the reasons for different RI values between species are touched upon, more discussion on why specific species (like S. alba) show lower resilience would be beneficial. Are these species more vulnerable to environmental stressors, or are their reproductive strategies less efficient in certain coastal conditions? Broader Ecological Implications: While the study is focused on the coast of West Muna Regency, it would strengthen the discussion to explore the broader ecological implications of the findings. How might these results inform mangrove conservation efforts elsewhere? Does the resilience observed align with global trends, or is it specific to this region? Inconsistency in Terminology: The terms used to describe mangrove density could be standardized. For example, sometimes "low" and "high" are used in relative terms without clear thresholds or criteria, which can confuse the reader. Providing clear cutoffs for what constitutes "low" versus "high" density or resilience in the discussion would be helpful. <p>Minor Adjustments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar and Sentence Structure: Some sentences are overly long or complex, making it harder to follow the narrative. Breaking down long sentences and simplifying some language would improve readability. For example, the sentence "This disparity is due to the different fertilization processes..." could be split to make it clearer. Consistency in Units and Formatting: Ensure that the units and formats used across the 	

Review Form 3

	tables, figures, and text are consistent for clarity.	
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.	Strengths of this paper: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive Data Presentation: The results section presents the density and recruitment index (RI) data for mangrove species in a detailed manner, broken down by species and station, which adds clarity and specificity to the findings. Connection to Previous Research: The discussion effectively links the findings to previous studies, such as those by Rahman et al. and Bengen et al., to contextualize the results and explain the variations in species density and recruitment index. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Add this reference to this manuscript; Climate Change Effects on the Sundarban Mangrove Ecosystem and Tiger Population Dynamics in the Indian Region	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Parthasarathi Barik
Department, University & Country	Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden