



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_36619
Title of the Manuscript:	WATER QUALITY STATUS OF RIVER DONAN DUE TO OPERATIONAL REFINERY PERTAMINA UNIT IV CILACAP-CENTRAL JAVA-INDONESIA
Type of the Article	Case study

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Asian Journal of Biology – Ms_AJOB_36619</p> <p>The title of the manuscript is "Water quality status of river Donan due to operational Refinery PERTAMINA Unit IV Cilacap Central Java-Indonesia".</p> <p>In the present study, water quality, phytoplankton and macrozoobenthos of River Donan were investigated and some diversity indices were applied to the biological data in order to evaluate the impact of waste water on the Donan River's water. However, this investigation depends on once collected water samples (is not enough for the purpose of this investigation), no correlation index was used to determine the relations of detected data. In the river ecosystems, the main factor controlling the quantity of phytoplankton is the water discharge. No any correlation with it in the paper. The content provides very little information on water quality and biological parameters. The manuscript seems to be incomplete at first instance.</p> <p>-The "Abstract" section has to be improved focusing the attention on especially the main results of the present study and to revise the numerical data and the units used.</p> <p>-This section would be reconstructed.</p> <p>-Rewritten of keywords is necessary.</p> <p>-The "Introduction" section also would be reconstructed to cover a wide part of literature which has been carried out on the same or on any other related subject. Better if the description of the study area could be moved to a separate section.</p> <p>-In the "Material and Method" section, the study area has to be described. It would be difficult for the readers of AJOB to get information of the study area.</p> <p>-The map appeared to be far from clear.</p> <p>-The section of "Materials and Methods" has to be reconstructed to describe in more details the date of sampling and the methods of analyses particularly for the biological parameters (phytoplankton or zoobenthos and the keys used for identification and quantitative determination methods).</p>	<p>Correction I Have Fixed</p> <p>Water quality based on plankton and benthos diversity was calculated by using the Shannon-Wiener Diversity Index (H) ⁽¹⁾ Sampling conducted on December 16, 2017. at a temperature of 28 ° Celcius, air pressure 765 mmHg, humidity 74.4 -78.7 % H₂O with northwest wind direction to southeast, wind speed 0.4-1.3 m / sec with cloudy weather</p> <p>Correction I Have Fixed</p> <p>Correction I Have Fixed</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>-It is also necessary to rewrite this section.</p> <p>- In the "Results and Discussion" section, very little water quality and biological data were given because of once collected samples. In addition, some other water quality parameters would be studied. It seems to be good that this investigation would be repeated in different seasons.</p> <p>- As it is clearly known by the scientific community, one of the most important parts of a manuscript is "discussion" section. The discussion section of the manuscript seems to be not in good level but it would be good to make some comparisons of detected data with national and international similar studies.</p> <p>-The "Reference" section has to be rewritten following the traditional methods in listing literature.</p> <p>- The scientific English of the manuscript is quite weak but it needs major revisions and the vast majority of sentences in the text have to be re-written again.English revision is necessary.</p> <p>The manuscript includes very few useful physico-chemical and biological data determined in an internationally importantaquatic ecosystem. The presentation and discussion of the study is in a weak scientific level. But the study needs much more effort for improvement to make the study more powerful and more meaningful.The references in the manuscript are not cover the new and modern literature.</p> <p>However, this manuscript would potentially interest for the readers of Asian Journal of biology. So the study needs repairable scientific major revisions and then could be considered again.</p>	<p>Correction I Have Fixed</p> <p>Correction I Have Fixed</p> <p>Correction I Have Fixed</p> <p>Correction I Have Fixed</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		