



yunandar yunandar <yunandar01@ulm.ac.id>

[biodiv] Submission Acknowledgement

1 message

Ahmad Dwi Setyawan <smujo.id@gmail.com>
Reply-To: Ahmad Dwi Setyawan <editors@smujo.id>
To: Dini Yunandar <yunandar01@ulm.ac.id>

Tue, Jan 7, 2020 at 8:00 PM

Dini Yunandar:

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, " Plankton biodiversity in dry season on various typologies of Paminggir peatland inundation, South Kalimantan, Indonesia" to Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity. With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal web site:

Submission URL: <https://smujo.id/biodiv/authorDashboard/submission/5196>

Username: yunandar

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work.

Ahmad Dwi Setyawan

[Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity](#)



yunandar yunandar <yunandar01@ulm.ac.id>

[biodiv] Editor Decision

2 messages

Smujo Editors <smujo.id@gmail.com>

Thu, Feb 13, 2020 at 2:33 PM

To: YUNANDAR <yunandar01@ulm.ac.id>, HEFNI EFFENDI <author@smujo.id>

YUNANDAR, HEFNI EFFENDI, WIDIATMAKA, YUDI SETIAWAN:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity, "Plankton biodiversity in various typologies of inundation in Paminggir swamp, South Kalimantan, Indonesia on dry season".

Our decision is to: Accept Submission

Smujo Editors
editors@smujo.id

[Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity](#)**Smujo Editors** <smujo.id@gmail.com>

Thu, Feb 13, 2020 at 2:34 PM

To: YUNANDAR <yunandar01@ulm.ac.id>, HEFNI EFFENDI <author@smujo.id>

YUNANDAR, HEFNI EFFENDI, WIDIATMAKA, YUDI SETIAWAN:

The editing of your submission, "Plankton biodiversity in various typologies of inundation in Paminggir swamp, South Kalimantan, Indonesia on dry season," is complete. We are now sending it to production.

Submission URL: <https://smujo.id/biodiv/authorDashboard/submission/5196>

Smujo Editors
editors@smujo.id

[Quoted text hidden]



[biodiv] Editor Decision

3 messages

Smujo Editors <smujo.id@gmail.com>
To: Dini Yunandar <yunandar01@ulm.ac.id>

Wed, Feb 5, 2020 at 6:20 AM

Dini Yunandar:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity, " Plankton biodiversity in dry season on various typologies of Paminggir peatland inundation, South Kalimantan, Indonesia".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Smujo Editors
editors@smujo.id

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Reviewer B:

The results of the review of the article with the title:

"Plankton biodiversity in the dry season on various typologies of Paminggir peatland inundation, South Kalimantan, Indonesia"

- Suitability of article topic for publication: Very Good
- The quality of the paper in terms of ideas/originality, novelty, and innovation: Good
- The language used, the clarity of the contents of the article and ease of understanding by the reader: Acceptable
- Abstract Brief, clear and complete, can attract attention and encourage people to take the time to get and read the full paper: Acceptable
- Clarity of disclosure of background of problems, differences with previous studies, and contributions that will be made in the introduction: Acceptable (It should be clarified that the problem statement is related to the typology of plankton inundation of biodiversity as natural food in peatland ecosystems)
- Method/Approach to Problem Solving Research designs, procedures (algorithms or flowcharts) are written clearly and in detail: Acceptable
- Presentation of results and sharpness of analysis (can be accompanied by tables and figures to facilitate understanding): Acceptable
- The essence of the findings of the research carried out and the presentations are clearly stated in conclusion: Good
- Appropriateness of references given, procedures for writing and referencing to manuscripts (all references must be referenced to manuscripts): Good (there are several references that are not in accordance with the way of writing)
- Recommended manuscripts for the Journal: Good
- Suggestions for Authors: check revisions in the manuscript
- Suggestions for editors: check revisions in manuscripts

RECOMMENDATION

This paper is: (check only one place)

Honors quality*

Acceptable

Acceptable with minor revisions*

V

Acceptable with major revisions* (review required after revision)

NOT ACCEPTABLE

Note for revision:

- Abstracts may not exceed 200 words
- Statements in the abstract need to be affirmed in relation to the research methodology (adjusted to those listed in the method and material
- It should be clarified that the problem statement is related to the typology of the biodiversity plankton inundation as a natural feed in peatland ecosystems
- Spatial Data on the dry season between June and July what year?
- Give a brief description of the supervised classification approach in the material and method (Stages of the process)
- Picture not clear
- Give an explanation in the picture and table
- Figure 3 does not exist
- Create new sub-section in Conclusion
- The area of Tampakang, Pandamaan, Ambahai, Palbatu, and Bararawa is not mentioned before ... please check again
- Reference list needs to be checked again according to the template

Recommendation: Revisions Required

 Reviewer E:

The subject dealt with in this article is indeed interesting and important, since it pertains the abundance of fish over the dry period in a large peatland area, and the idea of tackling this question on the basis of simultaneous analyses using remote sensing images together with field plankton sampling is well founded. At least, this is what I could gather because the English is very poor as compared with other articles already published by this Journal, and this constitutes a serious problem when trying to convey results and ideas.

Also there are major methodological flaws in treating the phytoplankton community. It remains unclear whether the numbers in Table 1 correspond to the number of different taxa from each taxonomic group or the number of individuals, which otherwise is not stated anywhere along the paper. Having said this, I find very unlikely that such abundant and diverse groups as Cyanobacteria (formerly Cyanophyta) and Bacillariophyceae (diatoms) were not recorded at all, at least in many localities. Also, Phylum is clearly too high a taxonomic level to try to draw any conclusions from diversity and/or evenness data, which are not representative. If the authors observe the paper by Zalocar et al. they cited here, they will see that all the phytoplankton has been identified and counted at species or genus level.

For the reasons exposed here, I regret to say that article is unacceptable in its present form.

Recommendation: Resubmit Elsewhere

 Reviewer A:
 Recommendation: Revisions Required

 Reviewer B:

The results of the review of the article with the title:

“Plankton biodiversity in the dry season on various typologies of Paminggir peatland inundation, South Kalimantan, Indonesia”

- Suitability of article topic for publication: Very Good
- The quality of the paper in terms of ideas/originality, novelty, and innovation: Good
- The language used, the clarity of the contents of the article and ease of understanding by the reader: Acceptable
- Abstract Brief, clear and complete, can attract attention and encourage people to take the time to get and read the full paper: Acceptable
- Clarity of disclosure of background of problems, differences with previous studies, and contributions that will be made in the introduction: Acceptable (It should be clarified that the problem statement is related to the typology of plankton inundation of biodiversity as natural food in peatland ecosystems)
- Method/Approach to Problem Solving Research designs, procedures (algorithms or flowcharts) are written clearly and in detail: Acceptable
- Presentation of results and sharpness of analysis (can be accompanied by tables and figures to facilitate understanding): Acceptable
- The essence of the findings of the research carried out and the presentations are clearly stated in conclusion: Good
- Appropriateness of references given, procedures for writing and referencing to manuscripts (all references must be referenced to manuscripts): Good (there are several references that are not in accordance with the way of writing)
- Recommended manuscripts for the Journal: Good
- Suggestions for Authors: check revisions in the manuscript
- Suggestions for editors: check revisions in manuscripts

-
RECOMMENDATION

This paper is: (check only one place)

Honors quality*

Acceptable

Acceptable with minor revisions*

V

Acceptable with major revisions* (review required after revision)

NOT ACCEPTABLE

Note for revision:

- Abstracts may not exceed 200 words
- Statements in the abstract need to be affirmed in relation to the research methodology (adjusted to those listed in the method and material
- It should be clarified that the problem statement is related to the typology of the biodiversity plankton inundation as a natural feed in peatland ecosystems
- Spatial Data on the dry season between June and July what year?
- Give a brief description of the supervised classification approach in the material and method (Stages of the process)
- Picture not clear
- Give an explanation in the picture and table
- Figure 3 does not exist
- Create new sub-section in Conclusion
- The area of Tampakang, Pandamaan, Ambahai, Palbatu, and Bararawa is not mentioned before ... please check again
- Reference list needs to be checked again according to the template

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Reviewer E:

The subject dealt with in this article is indeed interesting and important, since it pertains the abundance of fish over the dry period in a large peatland area, and the idea of tackling this question on the basis of simultaneous analyses using remote sensing images together with field plankton sampling is well founded. At least, this is what I could gather because the English is very poor as compared with other articles already published by this Journal, and this constitutes a serious problem when trying to convey results and ideas.

Also there are major methodological flaws in treating the phytoplankton community. It remains unclear whether the numbers in Table 1 correspond to the number of different taxa from each taxonomic group or the number of individuals, which otherwise is not stated anywhere along the paper. Having said this, I find very unlikely that such abundant and diverse groups as Cyanobacteria (formerly Cyanophyta) and Bacillariophyceae (diatoms) were not recorded at all, at least in many localities. Also, Phylum is clearly too high a taxonomic level to try to draw any conclusions from diversity and/or evenness data, which are not representative. If the authors observe the paper by Zalocar et al. they cited here, they will see that all the phytoplankton has been identified and counted at species or genus level.

For the reasons exposed here, I regret to say that article is unacceptable in its present form.

Recommendation: Resubmit Elsewhere

[Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity](#)

3 attachments



B-5196-Article Text-16598-1-4-20200113.doc
2321K



E-5196-Article Text-16598-1-4-20200113 commented.doc
2320K



A-5196-Article Text-16598-1-4-20200113_rev by Ardianor 02032020.doc
2325K

yunandar yunandar <yunandar01@ulm.ac.id>
To: Smujo Editors <smujo.id@gmail.com>

Wed, Feb 5, 2020 at 12:50 PM

Received, thank you.

[Quoted text hidden]

yunandar yunandar <yunandar01@ulm.ac.id>
To: rahmilao76@gmail.com

Tue, Jan 2, 2024 at 8:03 PM

[Quoted text hidden]

3 attachments



B-5196-Article Text-16598-1-4-20200113.doc
2321K



E-5196-Article Text-16598-1-4-20200113 commented.doc
2320K



A-5196-Article Text-16598-1-4-20200113_rev by Ardianor 02032020.doc
2325K