

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_91692
Title of the Manuscript:	STRUCTURE OF THE FISH COMMUNITY IN THE JATIGEDE RESERVOIR POST SIX YEARS OF FLOODING
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The article presents the composition of the fish community in the sixth year after flooding.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<b>INTRODUCTION</b> The introduction presents the ecological importance of the Jatigede reservoir in the region. They provide some information about the previous composition of the fish community <b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b> The selection of sampling locations is logical, the applied sampling and processing methods are correct. However, the formulas used to calculate diversity and the associated information and explanations are not clear, the use of lower and upper case letters (e.g. Pi, pi, S, etc.) is not consistent. These errors need to be corrected. <b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b> The presentation of the present research results is appropriate. However, in the comparison with previous data, it is missing at which sampling locations, how later, and with what severity the fish fauna were collected. This is the only way to give an exact assessment of the changes. <b>CONCLUSION</b> See comments above.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Katalin Zsuga
Department, University & Country	Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Hungary