

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_126638
Title of the Manuscript:	Biometric characteristics and condition factor of tropical freshwater <i>Atya scabra</i> Leach, 1815 in the Bia river, South-East Region, Côte D'Ivoire
Type of the Article	

**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>
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.	This scientific paper provides valuable information for the environment, fisheries and aquaculture. The data on the analyzed environmental parameters: air temperature, rainfall as well as those of the aquatic environment show an environmental picture of the situation on the ground and the conditions met for the growth and development of the species <i>Atya scabra</i> . The source of the air temperature and precipitation monitorization data is missing and their presentation is elliptical (air temperature and rainfall are same in both study area Aboisso and Biaka).	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Alternative title: Biometric characteristics and condition factor of tropical freshwater <i>Atya scabra</i> Leach, 1815 in the Bia River	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	At the Results and Discussion point 3.1. Environmental parameters is not appropriate, unless 3.2 becomes 3.1.1. and 3.3 becomes 3.1.2	
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 Introduction of the scientific paper summarizes the current state of freshwater shrimp research and argues its contribution to the scientific community. In the Materials and Methods it is not clearly specified how the freshwater shrimps were caught (fishing method: nets, traps, etc.) and the time of year when fishing was carried out. The Results of the paper are summarized, graphs and tables correspond to a scientific paper. From the technical point of view in Discussion might be important to mention and make a correlation between fishing methods and biometric characteristics taking into account the selectivity given by certain mesh sizes of nets or traps	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	References are sufficient but a recent scientific paper could be: Barros-Alves, S. D. P., Alves, D. F. R., & Hirose, G. L. (2021). Population biology of the freshwater shrimp <i>Atya scabra</i> (Leach, 1816)(Crustacea: Decapoda) in São Francisco River, Brazil: evidence from a population at risk of extinction. <i>Nauplius</i> , 29, e2021009.	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>The writing style appears relatively consistent throughout the paper. The language is academic and technical, appropriate for a scientific work. I did not identify any abrupt changes in tone or complexity. The terminology used is specific to the field.</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	-	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Stroe Maria Desimira</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Research and Development for Aquatic Ecology, Fisheries and Aquaculture, Romania</b>