

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Contemporary Research and Perspectives in Biological Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2826
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Annotated Check List of Ichthyofaunal Diversity in the Freshwater Tidal Stretch Along the Gosthani Estuary, Bheemunipatnam, East Coast of India</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Book chapter</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	The "Annotated Checklist of Ichthyofaunal Diversity in the Freshwater Tidal Stretch Along the Gosthani Estuary, Bheemunipatnam, East Coast of India" is very much important to the scientific community. Because estuarine ecosystems are vital biodiversity hotspots, and this study adds crucial information about the ichthyofaunal diversity in an understudied region. The paper can be useful for future workers in aspects related to ecology and conservation because it provides a complete species inventory. Knowing fish diversity in estuarine environments has direct implications for fisheries management and protection toward vulnerable species. Detailed and region-specific such data contribute greatly to enriching our global understanding of freshwater tidal ecosystems; I appreciate the effort of these authors.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The article title, "An Annotated Checklist on Ichthyofaunal Biodiversity in the Fresh Water Tidal Stretch Along Gosthani Estuary at Bheemunipatanam, East Coast India," is appropriate in reflecting the scope and focus of the study. It effectively conveys what is to be found within: a checklist of fish species and specifics on the geographic location. Although not overtly necessary, for improved clarity and aesthetic appeal without losing focus, it could be modified just slightly to read: "An Annotated Checklist of Freshwater Tidal Ichthyofaunal Diversity in the Gosthani Estuary, Bheemunipatnam (East Coast of India)."	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract of the article offers a perfect summary, giving an idea of what is to come in terms of scope, objectives, and key findings related to ichthyofaunal diversity in the Gosthani Estuary. Some more specific details related to the number of species identified and any special findings in relation to endemic, threatened, or commercially important species would make it more complete. A brief mention of the methods used for data collection would provide informative context regarding the scientific value base of such findings. Highlighting ecological or conservation implications if space allowed would have enriched abstracts with several takeaways. On its own, though, this is a very good abstract.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections and structure of the manuscript is mostly sound as it moves from introduction – methods – results – discussion in that order. This structure in the document makes it easier for the readers to follow the research steps as well as comprehend the results. Nevertheless, in order to enhance the understanding and the ease of the text even more, the authors should take care that each subsection is precise enough and detailed enough. For example, the methodology section should provide a detailed description of the sampling techniques and data analysis techniques for the sake of reproducibility. Also, it might be beneficial to the manuscript to add a separate section that contains conclusions, implications and synthesis of the findings. In general, the structure makes sense but it probably needs some refining in certain areas for clearness.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript seems to be scientifically and technically sound. The authors share a thorough ichthyospecies diversity checklist which is based on the field work and seems to have been ordered appropriately into a specific region. The research lends credibility since the use of appropriate taxonomic identification procedures is supplemented with appropriate data collection techniques. Furthermore, the results are substantiated and their arguments are constructed in a logical way which	

[Review Form2](#)

	improves the trustworthiness of the research. Still – it is essential to see to it that – detail and to justify if applicable data analysis method (and any other statistical assessments) and sampling strategy are sufficient to further reinforce the correctness of the findings.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :	The references given in the document appear relevant, however, a deep insight into them reveals that some of the references may be somewhat out of date. Therefore, I recommend updating the manuscript by adding more fresh literature on ichthyofaunal diversity, estuarine ecosystems and assessments of biodiversity in particular those that have been published within the last five years. Such will also make sure that the research is not outdated in terms of the current knowledge and practices. Besides, more localised or cross-study comparison of other estuary systems may be added as part of the discussion. Where I feel that other supplementary materials of this nature are lacking or that such works are missing from the manuscript, including these will boost the scientific integrity of the manuscript.	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	NIL	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Abhisek Saha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tufanganj College, Cooch Behar Panchanan Barma University, India</b>