

Result of Review

Title: Water Quality and Hispathology for Climbing Perch (*Anabas testudineus* Bloch) at Cempaka Mining, South Kalimantan, Indonesia

Author(s): RIZMI YUNITA, YENNY RISJANI, UUN YANUHAR & FADLY H. YUSRAN

Decision of Paper Selection

- Accept submission, no revisions required
- Accept submission, revisions required; please revise the paper according to comments
- Revise and resubmit for review
- Decline submission

What you should do? (For accepted papers)

- ✓ Revise the paper according to the comments (if applicable)
- ✓ All authors must agree on the publication, please inform us the agreement by E-mail.
- ✓ You have to pay a publication fee of 100.00USD for the paper.
 - ✧ You may pay the fee by login your account: www.macrothink.org/journal or,
 - ✧ Please find payment information at: www.macrothink.org/payment
- ✓ Please notify the Editor when payment has been made.

Proposed Schedule for Publication

- ✓ Vol. 2, No. 1, January 2014, if you meet above requirements within 4 weeks.
- ✓ The paper will be published in two week's time after the final draft completed.
- ✓ You may also ask to publish the paper later, if you need more time for revision or payment.

Additional Information

- ✓ Please fine author guidelines at: <http://www.macrothink.org/author>
- ✓ You may download e-journal in PDF from: www.macrothink.org/ast/ *free of charge*
- ✓ Any questions please contact the Editor at: ast@macrothink.org

Comments from Internal Editor

Evaluation	Grade
	Please fill a grade of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1(high to low)
Overall evaluation on the paper	3
Contribution to existing knowledge	3
Organization and Readability	2
Soundness of methodology	3
Evidence supports conclusion	2
Adequacy of literature review	2
Comments and Suggestions	
<p>(*) Re-edit the paper according to APA style and Author Guideline</p> <p>() Pictures/figures are not clear, 300 dpi is required</p> <p>() Transform footnotes to endnotes</p> <p>() Resize the tables/figures, to fit in A4 paper</p> <p>() Others:</p>	

Comments from External Reviewer

Evaluation	Grade
	Please fill a grade of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 (high to low)
Overall evaluation on the paper	3
Contribution to existing knowledge	3
Organization and Readability	3
Soundness of methodology	3
Evidence supports conclusion	2
Adequacy of literature review	2

Strengths

The topic is relevant and of great importance.

Weaknesses

1. The aim of the work and the results could be presented more clearly and concisely.
2. Background (introduction) part should be written. The author should give a better literature review about how mining process will affect the aquatic environment and aquatic organisms, the toxic effects of Hg on aquatic organisms (particularly fishes) rather than its social impact.
3. More detailed information about the sampling sites should be given, such as the distance to the diamond and gold mines. The author should also indicate if there is a control site which was not polluted.
4. According to the results, **result of Hg measurement was around 0.01 – 0.02 μgL^{-1} with average of 5 μgL^{-1}** . Why the average concentration exceeds 0.02 μgL^{-1} ? Hg concentrations at each sampling site should be given.
5. The discussion part of the manuscript is relatively weak. Relations among water quality, Hg accumulation in organisms and histopathology results should be discussed. Besides, the results should be compared with other studies.

Suggestions

1. Re-edit the texts in Fig 1 to make them visible. The positions of diamond and gold mines should be given in Fig 1.
2. The English writing should be improved. The manuscript should be proof-read by native English speakers.
3. Please see other suggestions in the attached word file.