Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJFAR_88717**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Ichthyofaunal diversity of downstream Dikhu river and its tributaries in Mon district of Nagaland, India**
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.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/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	**This study was trying to evaluate fisheries diversity at the Dikhu River with its tributaries. These kinds of studies are needed to be conducted for the understanding of the distribution of the diversity such a freshwater ecosystem in the threatened areas like Asian countries due to the higher population rates in these areas. Hence, these types of findings are important for the conservation and management purpose of fish diversity. The topic of the study is a topic of relevance and general interest to the readers of the journal. However, I felt that the paper is not an overall well in approach including the arrangement. However, On the other hand, I found the writing style of this manuscript is well written but still I would recommend checking the manuscript with a native speaker. In addition, I noticed the arrangement of the study in a good manner while the description of some very important points was inadequate or completely missing.** **Further, I have little confidence in some important analyses and came away with many questions to be able to recommend this paper for publication as it stands. Therefore, I recommend a Minor revision of this manuscript. I explain my concerns in more detail below. I ask that the authors specifically address each of my comments in their responses.** **Major comments:** **1. I have very few concerns about the introduction. the introduction part of the manuscript is good, however, the last paragraph of the introduction section can be placed in the methodology section as a study site.** **2. In the materials and method section, if authors could use a suitable map that clearly indicates the selected sampling sites of the study areas in a descriptive way, it would provide more value to the paper and readers will get a clear idea about the study area. Please provide the correct way of location. In addition, please provide relevant references for the used methods and techniques.** **3. Results and discussion section also should be a clear way of representing data proper way. Results representation is sufficient according to the methodology. Authors can shift the table to the results and discussion section, also, I did not see any mention of the table in the body of the manuscript. However, the discussion is not sufficient enough to reveal the findings of this study. Therefore, please try to make a solid discussion in order to provide clear justification. As a suggestion, I would like to recommend It is better if the authors can calculate diversity indices, in addition, please mention current anthropologic activities around the study sites and how it impacts fish diversity, meantime please try to give some recommendation for conservation management plans. Furthermore, I have already mentioned my other concern with track changes in the manuscript.** **4. In the abstract and conclusion, the abstract is well in format however, the abstract and conclusion should be rewritten according to the topic and objective of the paper after revising the suggestions and comments. In the conclusion, The authors can summarise the total number of fish species including as well here, and also in the abstract section.**	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	**1. Minot comments and suggestions are provided with the manuscript with track changes.**	
Optional/General comments	**Please recheck the authors guidelines provided by journal and try to rearrange whole manuscript according to the suggestions provided.**	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**H. K. S. De Zoysa**
Department, University & Country	**Rajarata University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka**