

Journal Name:	Journal of Biology and Nature
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOBAN_12512
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SEDIMENT PROPERTIES BETWEEN NYPA FRUTICANS-DOMINATED AND RHIZOPHORA-DOMINATED FORESTS IN IKO CREEK
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>

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>
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.	This study matters in the scientific community because the study is vital for advancing our understanding of mangrove ecosystem processes and coastal resilience. By comparing sediment properties, the research can inform evidence-based mangrove conservation and restoration strategies and contribute to the development of sustainable coastal management practices. I like this research because it has significant implications for policy and practice, ensuring science-informed decision-making.	Verified
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It would be better if the title is “ Comparative Analysis of Sediment Properties in Nypa fruticans and Rhizophora racemosa Dominated Forest of Iko Creek”	Verified
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 of the article is comprehensive however, there are just minor adjustment to be made for clarity. It would be better if stated as.. “ Results of the study revealed a significant knowledge gap in understanding Nypa fruticans invasion’s long-term ecological effects. The study emphasizes the need for conservation and targeted management strategies to preserve Rhizophora racemosa habitats, crucial for sustaining biodiversity and ecosystem resilience”.	Verified
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Some subsections in the result and discussion portion were not consistent from objectives, methodology up to the result. Re align subsections with objectives and methodology.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because of its rigorous methodology, results presented and interpreted accurately with a comprehensive literature to support the research findings	

think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	and this will contribute to existing knowledge and conservation efforts.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and recent. However, the author failed to include some of those in the References section	verified
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, even with minimal grammar corrections and proper labelling of tables. The extensive discussion provided already indicates a strong foundation. Proofread the manuscript.	

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Objective: In this portion, specify what are the parameters to be analyzed from the sediment samples you have collected. Be specific. You can write in the objective1: analyze the physico-chemical parameters of the sediment samples in both location..</p> <p>Materials and Methods Presentation and discussion on the methodology of other physico-chemical properties were absent in this section but it was part of the result and discussion. Include here your methodology and materials used in obtaining the temperature, dissolve oxygen, salinity, and electrical conductivity since you have these results.</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>References: Although the manuscript extensively cites various sources throughout the introduction, methods, results and discussion sections, there is a noticeable inconsistency in the references section. Ensure that all cited authors are included in the References section.</p> <p>"I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer" because I have already seen and read similar works like this but in a different geographical setting.</p>	
---	---	--

PART 2:

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