

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Zoology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_83773
Title of the Manuscript:	Spacio-temporal variation of the zooplanktonic community of Esa-Odo Reservoir, Esa-Odo, Osun State, Nigeria.
Type of the 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.journalajriz.com/index.php/AJRIZ/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>It is interesting study and will give a significant contribution in spacio-temporal variation of zooplankton in the lotic ecosystem, however there are several parts that need to be improved as I explained in detail below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Title is not too clear and need to be revised and mention zooplankton as bioindicator as you mentioned in the background of study.</li><li>2. Abstract → It's clear enough, however you have to explain briefly how your data been analysed.</li><li>3. Introduction → Lack of updated references to support your background of study, state of the art was not well developed and need to be improved, the references is out of dated</li><li>4. Materials and Methods → The equipment that you used in this study have to be mentioned clearly and the book that you used for identifying your plankton is very out of date and the data analysis has not clearly explained</li><li>5. Results → results have been presented clear enough, however the type graphs that used are confusing. You should change the graph style so the reader is more easy to understand to read your graph. The caption of your all graph also not too clear and the caption of the graph have to be clearly understood and stand alone. Anova results should be put in one summarize table.</li><li>6. Discussion → Authors have found a very interesting finding, however some finding has not yet discuss clearly, for example the ecological index (Diversity, Evenness, Richness, Simpson, Shannon, Margaleff index, etc) has not discussed clearly. This part is required to be improved.</li></ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>This manuscript need to be proof read by professional language editors because there are so many grammatical error and that was not use scientifically terms.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Authors have an interesting finding of their study, however this manuscript need to be improved and has a major revision</p>	

### 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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>There is not ethical issues in this manuscript</p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nita Rukminasari
Department, University & Country	Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia