



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_47084
Title of the Manuscript:	Ecological Approach of Plankton Responses to Water Quality Variables of Tropical River, South-eastern Nigeria: A Bio-indicator-Based Community Assessment of Idundu River.
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a lot of grammatical errors in the use of English that should be corrected. • There are a series of conceptual errors throughout the manuscript. In example: Diversity indices are not indices for water quality; evenness index values are high and not low, as stated in the MS, because it ranges between 0 and 1. • There is information that should have been presented and is not in the manuscript. In example: Volume of plankton samples (values are expressed only in numerical terms without reference to volume units); list of plankton species; statistical test used for the determination of significant differences (ANOVA?); how the mean values of studied variables were calculated; monthly variations of variables at each sampling station; among other missing data and information. • Some scientific names are written incorrectly. • Oxygen values seem to be very low for running waters and there is no explanation about that. • Principal Component Analysis does not show the explained variance of each component and description lacks details. • Table with correlations lacks of the associated values of "P" (probability) in order to determine which of them are significant. • Discussion is weak and has contradictory sentences, when it is stated that "plankton variations is due to difference in the levels of human activities in the different sampling stations", and in other sentences stated that the river is a "healthy environment". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the grammatical errors in the manuscript has been effected and corrected. • All the conceptual errors in the manuscript based on diversity indices has been corrected. PLEASE CHECK THE REVIEW MANUSCRIPT. • All the missing informations have been checked and inputed. (Statistical test used for this study was ANOVA in each sampling station, please check materials and method under section 2.4 and table 1 for presentation. Also, descriptive statistic was used to calculate the mean and standard deviation for each sampling station not monthly. • All the scientific names that was written incorrectly has been corrected. • Please through the discussion for the oxygen values. • PCA was only used to show the major distribution pattern of plankton groups in each sampling stations, not with the physical and chemical parameters measured. • Correlation table for P values have been corrected. PLEASE CHECK TABLE 4 AND 5. • All the contradictory sentence in the discussion has been reverted and corrected accordingly.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	No ethical issues existed.