

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_99049
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of the construction of the Souapiti hydroelectric dam on the ichthyofauna of the Konkouré River - case of the sub-prefecture of Tondon - Republic of Guinea
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, it is important to assess the impact of any developmental project on the environment and biodiversity Yes No, it needs modification as indicated in the text Yes Yes, to a large extent References are not sufficient. Also, new references are to be added. For instance, Baruah et al. (2012), Hazarika et al., (2014), Biswas (2018) Result & Discussion part to be elaborated comparing the work done elsewhere	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, to a large extent	
Optional/General comments	The article is to be revised in the light of the above suggestions	

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:	S.P. Biswas
Department, University & Country	Dibrugarh University, India