

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125441
Title of the Manuscript:	Conservation Status of Fishes Reported from Tapi District of Gujarat, India
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript on the conservation status of fishes in the Tapi district of Gujarat is important for the scientific community as it provides essential data on the biodiversity and ecological health of aquatic ecosystems in the region. By documenting fish species and assessing their conservation status, the study contributes to a better understanding of local biodiversity, which is crucial for the development of effective conservation strategies. The research can help policymakers and environmentalists prioritize conservation efforts in the face of habitat degradation and climate change. I appreciate the manuscript for its focus on a region that may be underrepresented in biodiversity studies, contributing to the global knowledge pool. However, it would be more impactful if it also addressed specific conservation challenges and included solutions.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview of the study, covering key elements such as the objective, methodology, species identified, and conservation status. However, it could benefit from a few adjustments to enhance its clarity and impact:</p> <p>### Suggested Additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objective Clarification: The phrase "An attempt was made" could be more assertive. For example, "This study aimed to assess the conservation status and diversity of fishes in Tapi District, Gujarat." Importance/Context: The abstract could briefly mention the ecological or conservation importance of studying fish diversity in this specific region (e.g., is the region under threat? Is it a biodiversity hotspot?). Results Interpretation: Instead of just listing numbers and categories, the abstract could interpret what the findings mean for conservation (e.g., the dominance of Cypriniformes might indicate a certain ecological pattern). Recommendations: A short statement on possible conservation actions or next steps based on the findings would make the abstract more forward-looking. <p>### Suggested Deletions/Edits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Species List: While the species names are informative, listing all of them in the abstract is too detailed. Consider summarizing by mentioning the most common or notable species and leaving the full list for the main text. For example: "The study identified 25 species across 11 orders, with Cypriniformes being the most dominant." Conservation Status Details: Instead of repeating "1 species," "2 species," etc., this information can be streamlined: "Among the 25 species, 1 was found to be Critically Endangered, 1 Not Evaluated, 2 Near Threatened, and 21 of Least Concern." 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound, as it follows a structured methodology for identifying fish species in the Tapi District of Gujarat over a defined study period. The classification of species based on taxonomic orders and families is accurate, aligning with standard biological nomenclature. Moreover, the conservation statuses provided, including categories like "Critically Endangered" and "Least Concern," follow internationally recognized systems such as the IUCN Red List, which adds credibility to the study. The manuscript also contributes valuable baseline</p>	

Review Form 3

	data, essential for future research and conservation efforts in the region. However, it would be further strengthened by discussing the potential causes of species' conservation statuses and the ecological implications of the findings.	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>⋮</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Studies: Including more recent research on freshwater fish biodiversity in nearby districts or regions of India could strengthen the context. • Conservation Frameworks: Studies on the application of IUCN Red List criteria or other conservation assessment frameworks specific to India or Southeast Asia might provide valuable insights. • Impact of Human Activity: References addressing the impact of human activity (e.g., pollution, habitat destruction) on freshwater ecosystems in the Tapi region or similar ecosystems in India could enhance the discussion of conservation implications. <p>By ensuring the reference list is current, regionally relevant, and comprehensive, the manuscript will be well-grounded in scientific literature.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
Optional/General comments	NA	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abhisek Saha
Department, University & Country	Tufanganj College, Cooch Behar Panchanan Barma University, India