

Review of: "Food and Feeding of Atlantic Mudskipper *Periophthalmus Barbarus* in Ogbo-Okolo Mangrove Forest of Santa Barbara River, Bayelsa State Niger Delta, Nigeria"

Lucas Nunes¹

¹ Universidade Federal Fluminense

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript presents interesting results about the ecology of this fish. However, the text needs to be rewritten to better focus on important issues related to the trophic ecology of this species. For example, a lot of information is given about morphology, but I did not understand the importance of this information for the results on diet. For instance, what is the relationship between the fish's mucus information and the species' diet? Below, I present a few suggestions to improve the manuscript, but a general review must be done.

1. The authors performed stomach content analyses, although not clear, but the keywords mentioned DNA barcoding. Please do not confound different methods to quantify trophic ecology. Instead, provide full information on how you performed the stomach content analyses before quantification of the food items. Follow the order: capture, fixation, biometry, removal of the stomach, stomach content analyses, food qualification, and quantification.
2. When possible, use scientific names for food categories.
3. Don't repeat results in the discussion and conclusion. Instead, in the discussion section, provide explanations of what your results tell about the trophic ecology of this species. It appears to be a very generalist and opportunistic species. This must mean something to the environment.
4. Fig. 1: It is difficult to read any information on the figure. You can only show the sampled sites, for example.
5. Neither the frequency of occurrence nor the numerical abundance will provide information on food item importance for the fish. For this, you can combine both methods by using indices such as the Feeding index (%IAi) or Relative Importance (%IRi) to calculate this importance.