

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_129935
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Zooplankton Communities and Water Quality of River Katsina-Ala at Kwantan-Sule
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.	The authors are analyzed Zooplankton diversity and evaluated water quality parameters in river water samples.	Well reported. This is done to assess the ecological status of the river which is lacking in available literature.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	The title now takes plankton communities with remover of 'zoo'
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.	NO, the authors are suggested to rewrite the abstract part.	The abstract has been revised for clarity. Thank you.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	NO, some clarifications are required.	The technical error on using zooplankton for all the organisms has been addressed.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	Thank you.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<p>The authors are analyzed Zooplankton diversity and evaluated water quality parameters in river water samples. They have calculated diversity indices, and population density. But, in this manuscript lack of scientific and technical errors are found, and they are,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">How authors included the class Diptera, Ephemerophyta, Arachnida and Protozoa under the zooplankton class?Not all the protozoans are zooplankton, only limited protozoan's species are considered as zooplankton species. Does you are identified species are zooplankton? Clarify it.The authors are estimated only limited number of water quality parameters? The analyzed water quality parameter does not provide any valuable information about the aquatic ecosystems.In materials and methods, the authors are given only limited number of water quality parameters, but in abstract and results part they have described additional parameters?The authors are suggested to improve materials and methods.Find attached original MS file, because some corrections and new references are included for your perusal. <p>The given score is 5. The authors are suggested to revise their manuscript carefully.</p>	<p>Thank you for your valuable comments. In order to address the technical error of using zooplankton to cover class Diptera, Ephemerophyta, Arachnida and Protozoa, the topic, objective and content of the manuscript have been corrected as plankton communities to cover zooplankton and other microfauna as not all protozoans are zooplankton as you rightly pointed out.</p> <p>Also, the reported water quality parameters in the abstract have also been included in the materials and methods which include BOD, DO and total hardness. These gives the M&M a clearer description of parameters studied.</p>

Review Form 3

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>	