

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Contemporary Research and Perspectives in Biological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2826
Title of the Manuscript:	Annotated Check List of Ichthyofaunal Diversity in the Freshwater Tidal Stretch Along the Gosthani Estuary, Bheemunipatnam, East Coast of India
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The work is an investigative report of the fish fauna present in the freshwater tidal stretch along Gosthani estuary, Bheemunipatnam, East Coast of India. The work depicts the fish species present in the mentioned waterbody along with their systematic position and trophic levels. The study reveals basic information about the community structure of the fish fauna of the sampled aquatic system.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title may be simplified as "Ichthyofauna of freshwater tidal stretch along Gosthani estuary, Bheemunipatnam, East Coast of India"	
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.	In the abstract the usage of the fish may be included	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The section head "Methodology" may be rectified as "Materials and Methods" as the study used certain materials eg. specimen bottles, different types of fishing nets, preserving solution etc.	
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.	The language of the manuscript at many places is not clear, mainly in the section "Results and Discussion". This part of the manuscript should be rectified or rewritten for a better analysis of the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Not, the language of the article needs improvement.	
Optional/General comments	The work is good, however, language clarity in the manuscript is lacking. Software used in preparing graphical presentation is not mentioned in the section "Materials and Methods"	

[Review Form2](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Janardan Pathak
Department, University & Country	B. Borooah College, India