

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_127945
Title of the Manuscript:	Seasonal Diversity and Abundance of Phytoplankton Influenced by Physicochemical Parameters in the Lower River Benue
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Phytoplankton diversity is important for ecosystem stability and food web. Diverse Phytoplankton are good indicators for ecosystem. This research provides basic information of the seasonal abundance of phytoplankton in different location related with water quality and nutrients. It is help us to understand phytoplankton dynamics is vital for maintaining the ecological balance and productivity of freshwater river systems.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is.	
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.	Yes, the abstract of article is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology is sound. Data management and interpretation is appropriate use of tables and figures but require to check overall data interpretation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Result section is required to check and correct carefully for data set.</p> <p>Figure (2) showed total abundance per month across the study period. The results should present with stacked bar graph, each bar represent total abundance with segments represent individual specie abundance.</p> <p>Figure (3) Please make it sure dry season or across the study period</p> <p>Does the figure (4) represents across the study period?</p> <p>Figure (5) also should present like figure (11).</p> <p>The figure (8) is same with figure (10). Figure of Total abundance per month during across the season in River Benue is missing</p> <p>Does the Figure (10) is for location site Ibi?</p> <p>Does the figure (11) represents the across the season?</p> <p>Please add location site for figure (12) and (13).</p>	

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:	Nandar Aye Winn
Department, University & Country	Myanmar