

Review of: "Reef Fish in the Vitória-Trindade Seamount Chain of the Southwestern Atlantic: Biogeographical Corridors and Impact of Fishing"

Dr. Sourav Maity

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The present work, entitled "Reef Fish in the Vitória-Trindade Seamount Chain of the Southwestern Atlantic: Biogeographical Corridors and Impact of Fishing," carried out by Martins et al., seems to be interesting, but major modifications are required prior to its acceptance.

1. The abstract should be rewritten. The highlights, importance, and novelty of the study are missing. These points should be incorporated in the revised abstract.
2. Many spelling, grammatical, and typographical errors are there. Revise the abstract accordingly.
3. The keywords should not contain any words already in the manuscript title.
4. English writing is very poor in the introduction section. Rewrite.
5. The data reference is very old (nearly three decades). Use current data in the revised manuscript.
6. The reference citations used in the manuscript are not uniform. Rewrite.
7. Highlights of the study are very weak. Explain briefly.
8. Please briefly outline the engineering and environmental benefits of your research.
9. Significance of the work. What is the significance of the process, methodology, results, etc.? Why is it interesting?
10. The introduction section contains a lot of very old citations as a reference to the present work. But much work has been done on this topic in the last 5 years. Use recent references.
11. No present references exist (2024 or 2023) in the manuscript; has any research taken place on this topic? Rewrite.
12. The novelty and importance of the present study should be highlighted in the introduction section.
13. There are many English and grammatical mistakes in the introduction section. Rewrite.
14. The introduction section lacks in-depth background information about the present research and the research gaps associated with it. Rewrite.
15. What is the novelty (originality) of the work? And what is new in your work that makes a difference in the body of knowledge? What has been done that goes beyond the existing research that are the technological innovations of the work?
16. Typos, uppercase, and spacing errors. This mistake has been seen throughout the manuscript, including the abstract and reference citations. Please go through the formatting carefully.
17. Water quality parameter analysis of the source should be incorporated.
18. The results and discussion section needs to be rewritten, in-depth discussions are missing with present citations (and

not with research carried out two decades earlier).

19. Figure captions are not aligned, and formatting errors are there.
20. An in-depth discussion of all the analyses is required.
21. How do pH, conductance, and alkalinity affect the present research? Please explain with suitable references.
22. Contribution to the field. How does this paper advance the current knowledge?
23. What are the potential applications and benefits of this work?
24. What are the bottlenecks of this work, and how did you mitigate the impacts attributed to them?
25. The manuscript has references, but most are very old. These references should be substituted with the recent ones throughout the manuscript.
26. The discussion section lacks an in-depth review of the present research with other works in this field. Most of the citations are old, as old as the 1980s. Has no research been conducted in this field during this tenure?
27. Novelty, future scope, and possible application under the discussion section have not been explained. Authors should incorporate these topics in the manuscript.
28. The Conclusion section is missing.