


Nama Jurnal : Berkala Penelitian Hayati

Alamat URL : <https://berkalahayati.org/index.php/jurnal>

Edisi Terbit : Volume 31 No 1, 2025

No.	Kegiatan	Tanggal/Bulan/Tahun	Halaman
1.	Submit Manuscript	17 Juli 2024	1-2
2.	Decision on manuscript	4 September 2024	3-6
3.	Catatan Review Article (catatan koreksi terhadap artikel awal)	21 November 2024	7-9
4.	First Reminder to revise	29 November 2024	10
5.	Second Reminder to revise	13 Desember 2024	10
6.	Respon of Author	5 Januari 2025	11-12
7.	Manuscript revision (artikel yang telah diperbaiki)	15 Januari 2025	11-12
8.	Decision after revise	26 Januari 2025	12
9.	Official acceptance	26 Januari 2025	12
10.	Koreksi format	26 Januari 2025	14
11.	Article yang telah dikoreksi formatnya	4 Februari 2025	14
12.	Informasi terbit	22 Februari 2025	14

Submission to Berkala Penelitian Hayati

Participants

Berkala Penelitian Hayati (ojsadmin)

Dr. Nuning Mahmudah Noor (nuning_polinela123)

Messages

Note	From
Dear Authors,	ojsadmin
The characteristics and paralytic shellfish poisoning test in Lampung coast fresh green mussel (<i>Perna viridis</i>)	2024-07-17 02:42 PM
Your above-referenced submission has been assigned a manuscript number: BKJT-316	
Thank you for submitting your work to this journal.	
Please suggest potential reviewers for this submission (4-5 "suggested reviewers") together with their affiliation and email address.	
NOTE: suggested reviewer should come from a different institution from the author lists, and 1 reviewer should come from a different country. Do not suggest anyone you have another conflict of interest with. Please note that the editors may not use your suggestions, but your help is appreciated and may speed up the selection of appropriate reviewers.	
In addition, please review your metadata on the author submission site (including the author list, affiliation and corresponding author). Then, make sure that your submission in accordance with the guidelines)	
Link Author Guideline: https://berkalahayati.org/index.php/jurnal/Author_Guidelines	
--	

Best Regard,
Managing Editor
Berkala Penelitian Hayati

► Dear Managing Editor of Berkala Penelitian Hayati,

nuning_polinela123
2024-07-20 07:40
AM

Here we suggest the list of potential reviewers for review our manuscript.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Dr. Nuning Mahmudah Noor

 [nuning_polinela123, List Potential Reviewers Nuning.docx](#)

Add Message



Participants

Berkala Penelitian Hayati (ojsadmin)

Dr. Nuning Mahmudah Noor (nuning_polinela123)

Messages

Note

From

Manuscript Number: BKJT-316

ojsadmin

Characteristics and paralytic shellfish poisoning test in Lampung coast fresh green mussel (*Perna viridis*)

2024-09-04 03:31
PM

Dear Authors,

The reviewers have commented on your above paper. They indicated that it is not acceptable for publication in its present form without "Major Revision". Thus, We invite you to suitably address the reviewers' comments (attached file), revise, and resubmit your manuscript due on or before July 15th, 2024.

The following documents also should be included during resubmission:

(1) the revised manuscript with tracked changes and (2) a response or rebuttal to each point raised by the reviewers (response to reviewer). Should you find any hurdle during revision process, do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

--

Best Regard,

Managing Editor

Berkala Penelitian Hayati

#Reviewer 1

It was an interesting study about the effect of green mussels consumption. The results might provide an interesting information that useful for society. However,

there are several questions to improve the manuscript quality.

1. Please rewrite it. Because the results did not found/identified any saxitoxin residue.

It is more suitable to evaluate the effect of green mussels consumption from different beaches. (Line number 8)

2. Please specify! (Line number 11).

3. How can the author justify the affected and non-affected areas? Please add the details in the methods. (Line number 45)

4. Please specify the morphological characteristics and how much samples taken to identify its abnormalities? (Line number 52)

5. Please specify the strain, weight, and age of the mice! (Line number 74)

6. Please correct! (Line number 76)

7. Please provide the figures of each green mussels! (Line number 90)\

8. It is true? Because the fat result from Mutun beach is significantly different. (Table 2)

9. Please explain more details in the discussion section and compare it with the previous study about green mussels effect!

#Reviewer 2

Title

Title is OK but could be improved. It could be written also as : Evaluation of paralytic shellfish poisoning of fresh green mussel (*Perna viridis*) affected by the Lampung Coast red tide phenomenon.

Introduction

The introduction was OK.

Methodology

The methodology should be written in a more precise manner and not too general. In line 62, it is unclear why the shell was blend and used in this study. Therefore, the parts used as the sample should be well addressed. When you say muscle extract what does this mean? The extract comes from the meat or shell? It is also unclear the method of extracting the sample as it is written too general.

Results

The results were OK. However, the number of shellfish used in this experiment was not mentioned. Therefore unsure of the statistical data. Analysis of the mice could be done on the animals behavior as well instead of studying its feces. The feces also could be analysed even further to produce more valid data.

Overall the manuscript is OK however, it should be improved for publication.

#Reviewer3

Abstract

Lack of Method Details: The abstract does not sufficiently explain the research methods used. It only mentioned "bioassay method" without further details.

Unspecific Results: The results are generally mentioned without providing specific quantitative data or supporting statistics.

Unclear Conclusions: The abstract does not clearly present the study's conclusion. This makes it difficult for the reader to understand the main implications of the study.

Introduction

Background lacks depth: The introduction provides basic information on the nutritional value of green mussels but lacks depth in explaining the urgency of research into the red tide phenomenon and its impact on human health. claims in the article are not supported by adequate references. For example, the claim about "the nutritional value of green mussels being comparable to beef, eggs and chicken" lacks a directly supporting reference in the text

Poorly Defined Research Objectives: The research objectives are mentioned but not explained in detail how the research will address the questions posed or problems identified.

Methods

Incomplete Description of Methods: The research methods were not described in detail. For example, there was no information on the number of samples taken from each location or their selection.

Ethical Protocols Not Described: While it was mentioned that an ethical protocol was approved, there was no explanation of how it was implemented during the study.

Lack of Details on Data Analysis: There was no explanation of how the data was analyzed, what statistical methods were used, or how the results were interpreted.

Results

Inconsistent Data: The results presented in the table are not always consistent with the text description. For example, the proximate analysis results showed differences not adequately explained in the text. The feces from the Mutun Beach sample returned to normal on the third day of treatment, whereas in Table 3, it remained mushy.

Why is the amount of PSP in the blood or intestines of mice not measured? Is it sufficient to analyze PSP only by observing the feces of mice? It could be that the mice are retching due to the green mussel extract that has not been accepted by the mice's intestines.

Lack of Statistical Analysis: No clear statistical analysis supports the claim that no significant differences exist between samples from different locations.

Discussion

Data Interpretation lacks depth: The discussion does not sufficiently explain why certain results were obtained or how they compare to previous studies.

No Discussion of Limitations: The discussion did not mention the limitations of the study, such as the small sample size or potential bias in sampling.

Unclear Recommendations: There are no clear recommendations for further research or practical implications of the study findings.

Conclusion

Conclusions are Too General: The conclusion is too general and does not specifically summarize the study's main findings.

No Practical Implications: The conclusions do not provide clear practical implications for consumers or other relevant parties.

Lack of Summary of Findings: The conclusion does not summarize the main findings and contributions of the study to the relevant field of science.

References

Species name terms in references have not been italicized

► Dear Managing Editor of Berkala Penelitian Hayati,

Here we submit our revised manuscript based on reviewers suggestions.

We apologize for the very late reply.

Thank you for your understanding.

Best regards,

Dr. Nuning Mahmudah Noor

📎 [nuning_polinela123, Rebuttal Letter Berkala Hayati Nuning Mahmudah Polinela 050924.docx](#)

📎 [nuning_polinela123, R1-BKJT316-REV_ROUND 1.docx](#)

nuning_polinela123

2025-01-15 04:23

AM

Major Revision-BKJT316 Inbox x



Berkala Penelitian Hayati <official@berkalahayati.org>
to me ▾

📧 Wed, Sep 4, 2024, 10:31 PM ☆ 😊 ↶ ⋮

Manuscript Number: BKJT-316

Characteristics and paralytic shellfish poisoning test in Lampung coast
fresh green mussel (*Perna viridis*)

Dear Authors,

The reviewers have commented on your above paper. They indicated that it is not acceptable for publication in its present form without "Major Revision". Thus, We invite you to suitably address the reviewers' comments (attached file), revise, and resubmit your manuscript due on or before October 4th, 2024.

The following documents also should be included during resubmission:
(1) the revised manuscript with tracked changes and (2) a response or rebuttal to each point raised by the reviewers (response to reviewer).
Should you find any hurdle during revision process, do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

—
Best Regard,
Managing Editor
Berkala Penelitian Hayati

#Reviewer 1

It was an interesting study about the effect of green mussels consumption. The results might provide an interesting information that useful for society. However, there are several questions to improve the manuscript quality.

1. Please rewrite it. Because the results did not found/identified any saxitoxin residue. It is more suitable to evaluate the effect of green mussels consumption from different beaches. (Line number 8)
2. Please specify! (Line number 11).
3. How can the author justify the affected and non-affected areas? Please add the details in the methods. (Line number 45)
4. Please specify the morphological characteristics and how much samples taken to identify its abnormalities? (Line number 52)
5. Please specify the strain, weight, and age of the mice! (Line number 74)
6. Please correct! (Line number 76)
7. Please provide the figures of each green mussel! (Line number 90)
8. It is true? Because the fat result from Mutun beach is significantly different. (Table 2)
9. Please explain more details in the discussion section and compare it with the previous study about green mussels effect!

#Reviewer 2

Title

Title is OK but could be improved. It could be written also as :
Evaluation of paralytic shellfish poisoning of fresh green mussel (*Perna viridis*) affected by the Lampung Coast red tide phenomenon.

Introduction

The introduction was OK.

Methodology

The methodology should be written in a more precise manner and not too general. In line 62, it is unclear why the shell was blend and used in this study. Therefore, the parts used as the sample should be well addressed. When you say muscle extract what does this mean? The extract comes from the meat or shell? It is also unclear the method of extracting the sample as it is written too general.

Results

The results were OK. However, the number of shellfish used in this experiment was not mentioned. Therefore unsure of the statistical data. Analysis of the mice could be done on the animals behavior as well instead of studying its feces. The feces also could be analysed even further to produce more valid data.

Overall the manuscript is OK however, it should be improved for publication.

#Reviewer3

Abstract

Lack of Method Details: The abstract does not sufficiently explain the research methods used. It only mentioned "bioassay method" without further details.

Unspecific Results: The results are generally mentioned without providing specific quantitative data or supporting statistics.

Unclear Conclusions: The abstract does not clearly present the study's conclusion. This makes it difficult for the reader to understand the main implications of the study.

Introduction

Background lacks depth: The introduction provides basic information on the nutritional value of green mussels but lacks depth in explaining the urgency of research into the red tide phenomenon and its impact on human health.

claims in the article are not supported by adequate references. For example, the claim about "the nutritional value of green mussels being comparable to beef, eggs and chicken" lacks a directly supporting reference in the text

Poorly Defined Research Objectives: The research objectives are mentioned but not explained in detail how the research will address the questions posed or problems identified.

Methods

Incomplete Description of Methods: The research methods were not described in detail. For example, there was no information on the number of samples taken from each location or their selection.

Ethical Protocols Not Described: While it was mentioned that an ethical protocol was approved, there was no explanation of how it was implemented during the study.

Lack of Details on Data Analysis: There was no explanation of how the data was analyzed, what statistical methods were used, or how the results were interpreted.

Results

Inconsistent Data: The results presented in the table are not always consistent with the text description. For example, the proximate analysis results showed differences not adequately explained in the text. The feces from the Mutun Beach sample returned to normal on the third day of treatment, whereas in Table 3, it remained mushy. Why is the amount of PSP in the blood or intestines of mice not measured? Is it sufficient to analyze PSP only by observing the feces of mice? It could be that the mice are retching due to the green mussel extract that has not been accepted by the mice's intestines.

Lack of Statistical Analysis: No clear statistical analysis supports the claim that no significant differences exist between samples from different locations.

Discussion

Data Interpretation lacks depth: The discussion does not sufficiently explain why certain results were obtained or how they compare to previous studies.

No Discussion of Limitations: The discussion did not mention the limitations of the study, such as the small sample size or potential bias in sampling.

Unclear Recommendations: There are no clear recommendations for further research or practical implications of the study findings.

Conclusion

Conclusions are Too General: The conclusion is too general and does not specifically summarize the study's main findings.

No Practical Implications: The conclusions do not provide clear practical implications for consumers or other relevant parties.

Lack of Summary of Findings: The conclusion does not summarize the main findings and contributions of the study to the relevant field of

References

Species name terms in references have not been italicized

2 Attachments • Scanned by Gmail



Thank you for your feedback.

Thank you, I will do that.

Thank you for your information.

Reply

Forward



←

📎

🕒

🗑️

✉️

📁

⋮


9 of 14

⏪ ⏩

(Reminder) Revision progress-BKJT316

Inbox x

🖨️ 📧



Berkala Penelitian Hayati <official@berkalahayati.org>
to me ▾

Fri, Nov 29, 2024, 6:49 AM

☆ 😊 ↩️ ⋮

Dear Authors,

We recently invited you to revise your above-referenced manuscript in accordance with the reviewers' comments, but have not yet received your manuscript. We would appreciate you letting us know if we can expect to receive a revision.

If you are revising the work, please be sure to include with the revised manuscript a list of changes or a rebuttal to each point raised by the reviewers. Should you find any hurdle during revision process, do not hesitate to contact us.

----- Original Message -----
Subject: Revision progress-BKJT316
Date: 2024-11-21 07:50
From: Berkala Penelitian Hayati <official@berkalahayati.org>
To: Nuning Mahmudah Noor <noornuningmahmudah@gmail.com>

Manuscript Number: BKJT-316
Characteristics and paralytic shellfish poisoning test in Lampung coast fresh green mussel (*Perna viridis*)

Dear Authors,

We recently invited you to revise your above-referenced manuscript in

←

📎

🕒

🗑️

✉️

📁

⋮


6 of 14

⏪ ⏩

(2nd Reminder) Revision progress-BKJT316

Inbox x

⏴ 🖨️ 📧



Berkala Penelitian Hayati <official@berkalahayati.org>
to me ▾

Fri, Dec 13, 2024, 11:38 AM

☆ 😊 ↩️ ⋮

Dear Authors,

We recently invited you to revise your above-referenced manuscript in accordance with the reviewers' comments, but have not yet received your manuscript. We would appreciate you letting us know if we can expect to receive a revision.

If you are revising the work, please be sure to include with the revised manuscript a list of changes or a rebuttal to each point raised by the reviewers. Should you find any hurdle during revision process, do not hesitate to contact us.

----- Original Message -----
Subject: (Reminder) Revision progress-BKJT316
Date: 2024-11-29 06:49
From: Berkala Penelitian Hayati <official@berkalahayati.org>
To: Nuning Mahmudah Noor <noornuningmahmudah@gmail.com>

Dear Authors,

We recently invited you to revise your above-referenced manuscript in accordance with the reviewers' comments, but have not yet received your manuscript. We would appreciate you letting us know if we can expect to receive a revision.



Nuning Mahmudah Noor <noornuningmahmudah@gmail.com>
to Berkala ▾

Sun, Jan 5, 10:31 PM ☆ 😊 ↩ ⋮

Dear Managing Editor of Berkala Penelitian Hayati,

We apologize for the very late reply.
Now we are still working in progress to revise our manuscript according to the reviewer suggestions.
We may ask for the additional time in order to complete our revision.
Thank you for your understanding.

Best regards,

Dr. Nuning Mahmudah Noor



Berkala Penelitian Hayati <official@berkalahayati.org>
to me ▾

Mon, Jan 6, 9:49 AM ☆ 😊 ↩ ⋮

Dear Author,

Thank you for your update regarding the progress of your manuscript revision. We understand that revising a manuscript according to reviewer feedback requires considerable time and effort.

We appreciate your commitment to improving your manuscript and acknowledge your request for an extension. Please let us know the additional time frame you require to complete the revisions. We will do

our best to accommodate your request within our publication schedule.

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript. Please do not hesitate to reach out if you need any further assistance.



Nuning Mahmudah Noor <noornuningmahmudah@gmail.com>
to Berkala ▾

Mon, Jan 6, 2:21 PM ☆ 😊 ↩ ⋮

Dear Managing Editor of Berkala Penelitian Hayati,

We will try to complete it within 2 weeks.
Thank you for your understanding.

Best regards,

Dr. Nuning Mahmudah Noor



Nuning Mahmudah Noor <noornuningmahmudah@gmail.com>
to Berkala ▾

Wed, Jan 15, 11:43 AM ☆ 😊 ↩ ⋮

Dear Managing Editor of Berkala Penelitian Hayati,

Here we submit our revised manuscript based on reviewers suggestions.

We apologize for the very late reply.

Thank you for your understanding.

Best regards,

Dr. Nuning Mahmudah Noor

2 Attachments • Scanned by Gmail



Berkala Penelitian Hayati <official@berkalahayati.org>

to me ▾

Sun, Jan 26, 2:58 PM



Manuscript Number: BKJT-316
The Characteristics and paralytic shellfish poisoning test in Lampung
coast fresh green mussel (*Perna viridis*)

Dear Authors,

We are pleased to inform you that your above reference paper has been
accepted for publication in Berkala Penelitian Hayati.

Below are comments from the editor and reviewers.

Your accepted manuscript will now be transferred to our production
department and work will begin on the creation of the proof and
lay-outting the paper. If we need any additional information to create
the proof, we will let you know. If not, you will be contacted again in
the next few days with a request to approve the proof and to complete
the payment for publication.

Thank you for submitting your work to Berkala Penelitian Hayati.

—

Best Regard,
Managing Editor
Berkala Penelitian Hayati

Publication Information-BKJT316 Inbox x



Berkala Penelitian Hayati <official@berkalahayati.org>
to me ▾

Manuscript Number: BKJT-316
The Characteristics and paralytic shellfish poisoning test in Lampung coast fresh green mussel (*Perna viridis*)

Dear Authors

We are pleased to inform you that the proof for your upcoming publication is ready for review.

We ask you to check that you are satisfied with the accuracy of the copy-editing, and with the completeness and correctness of the text, tables, and figures. To assist you with this, copy-editing changes have been highlighted in the text. Once you make corrections and submit to us, you can no longer make further corrections. You are required to make account and upload your final version of your manuscript in the website. We can not publish the document if they do not have an account in our system portal (<https://berkalahayati.org/index.php/jurnal>), because it links to the publication process.

In addition, the payment for further publication process is also requested.

Details for Payment:

Journal Administration = IDR 1,400,000
Recipient Name: PERKUMPULAN BIOLOGI JAWA TIMUR
Account number: 144-00-2021242-6, Mandiri KCP Malang Universitas Brawijaya

We will do everything possible to get your article published quickly and accurately.

The sooner we hear from you, the sooner your corrected article will be published online.

—

Best Regard,
Managing Editor
Berkala Penelitian Hayati

One attachment • Scanned by Gmail ⓘ



Layouting-BKJT3...

