

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_88725
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of environmental variables on fish distribution in the flooded swamp forest of the Lake Tumba micro-basin on the Mbandaka- Research Center in Ecology and Forestry of Mabali (CREF Mabali) road axis in Bikoro, Equateur Province (DR Congo)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The main objective of this study was to investigate the influence of environmental variables on fish distribution in the study area. However, there is no mentioned at all on how the environmental variables namely the physical chemical parameters was collected. The author need to provide information on physical chemical measurement in the methods 2. The author need to provide details on how the substrate was collected and analysed – what method used. Please include details in terms of laboratory for sediment determination 3. The authors need to briefly mentioned about the ecological indices calculation in the method 4. I suggest to combine the physical-chemical parameters into one section. Please combine table 7 & 8. 5. Table 9 is not useful. This table should describe the human activities at each site rather than putting something too general and not helpful to explain the variability of the anthropogenic activities to the fish distribution 6. Section 2.3.1, provide details of the methods used for data collection. Which techniques were used at each site, how long is the duration of fish sampling. When was the samples collected – is it one time or few times based on the period or season. This is not clearly explained in the manuscript 7. Pg 4 – provide reason why the sites were selected for this study. What is the uniqueness of the sampling area 8. Discussion section, para 2 – pg 19. The authors should expand the discussion in terms of fish techniques and example that differentiate the species collected in comparison to the past literature. Could any of the species newly recorded or not found in this paper related to the environmental parameter? Explain 9. Abstract – please improve your conclusion in the abstract to relate to study findings. Currently, there is no evidence that link your data to antropogenic activities. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pg 5, section 2.3.2 – please change the word ‘manipulations’ to better and clearly explained what were carried out. 	
Optional/General comments	Overall, good effort. Need to improve as per comments above so that the work is scientifically demonstrated.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zati Sharip
Department, University & Country	National Water Research Institute of Malaysia, Malaysia