

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_126236
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Study on Fishing Gear and Methods commonly used at an Oxbow lake of South-West Bangladesh</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

[Review Form 3](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><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></p>	<p><b>Importance of the Manuscript for the Scientific Community:</b> This study contributes to understanding the fishing practices in the oxbow lake system of Bangladesh, offering insights into the impacts of various fishing gears on biodiversity. Such research is significant as it provides a baseline for policymakers to frame conservation strategies. However, the study could have further benefited from a deeper focus on the ecological impacts and sustainability of fishing practices.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>Suitability of the Title:</b> The title is mostly appropriate. However, it could be more precise. Suggested revision: <i>"Fishing Gears and Practices in the Bukhora Oxbow Lake: Implications for Biodiversity Conservation in South-West Bangladesh"</i>. This will reflect the conservation aspect that the study touches upon.</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p><b>Abstract Review:</b> The abstract provides a decent overview of the findings. However, it lacks mention of the conservation significance and some key findings such as specific illegal gears and seasonal fishing patterns. Including such details would improve the clarity and relevance.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>Structure and Subsections Appropriateness:</b> The manuscript follows a logical structure with standard sections such as introduction, methods, results, and discussion. However, the discussion could benefit from better integration with existing literature to highlight the novelty of the findings. Additionally, separating findings on illegal fishing gears into a distinct subsection would improve readability.</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p><b>Scientific Correctness and Robustness:</b> The research is generally sound and addresses important aspects of fishing practices in an underexplored context. However, the statistical rigor could be improved—especially with respect to comparing CPUE data across gear types. There is also a need for more thorough discussions about the implications of gear selectivity and fish species depletion on future fisheries. Including more detailed seasonal or environmental factors affecting fish abundance would make the results more robust.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :</p>	<p><b>References Sufficient and Recent?:</b> The references cover a good range of topics but could be updated with more recent studies on sustainable fishing practices or case studies in similar ecosystems. Some redundant references should be merged, such as multiple citations from Ahmed (2005). Suggested references: (i) Articles on community-based management in wetland ecosystems. (ii) Additional FAO reports on illegal and unregulated fishing impacts in inland water systems.</p>	

### Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Language Quality:</b> The English used is generally clear but could benefit from minor grammatical revisions. For instance, phrases like "few amount" should be revised to "small amounts," and the word "scine" should be corrected to "seine." Inconsistent capitalization (e.g., "baor" vs. "Baor") should be standardized.</p> <p><b>Figures and Tables:</b> The visual representations are helpful. However, some figures are slightly cluttered, such as Figure 3 on catch composition. Adding more descriptive captions would enhance clarity. Furthermore, Figures 4 and 7 would benefit from standardized scales on their axes to allow better comparison.</p> <p><b>Ethics Statement:</b> The manuscript states that ethics approval was not required. It would be useful to include a brief rationale explaining why, such as the non-invasive nature of the study.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The study provides valuable insights into fishing gear diversity, CPUE, and the impact of different fishing practices on biodiversity. However, the manuscript could be enhanced by including a stronger conclusion that offers actionable recommendations for policymakers. Furthermore, introducing the socio-economic aspects of illegal fishing (beyond conservation) would add depth to the discussion.</p>	

### **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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Deepanjana Saha
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India