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

Carlos Gonzalez[1]

1 Universidad Veracruzana

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The title of this paper should be modified because the study regards part of the fish community (27%), 34 of 125 total fish species. On the other hand, the sampling is very selective, and the most important and robust data correspond to fisheries. For that, the paper should focus on this topic instead of the biogeographical analyses.

If the title and the principal goal change, the abstract should be adjusted.

The introduction should be modified because the most important data that authors cite are the demersal fish components caught in three zones of the coast of Brazil and their abundance. For biogeographical analyses, the authors should regard all fish species, not only the fishes caught but also the fish species recorded in the region. I propose to emphasize the fishing more than biogeography because the authors did not consider all fish components.

In materials and methods, I suggest avoiding the excessive explanation (for example, Sorensen index) and ordering data. First, the identification of fishes, followed by measures, catch data, etc. The authors should review the order of the activities carried out, and these should be in accordance with the results and the discussion.

There are some omissions; for example, in materials and methods, a Statistical comparisons (Mann-Whitney U test) is cited, but they do not appear in the results. Another case is the evaluation of the condition of every hook that does not appear in the results either. In another case, the authors cite that they weighted the fishes; then, why did they not consider the fish biomass? Or the estimation of fish effort and boats data?

In results, I suggest beginning with a description of the fish species composition, the most speciose families, and the most abundant fish species. After this, the size classes and the catch data, followed by the distribution patterns (north, south, etc.). At the end, using all data (125 fish species plus the fish species reported in other studies for this region) to try to explain the fish biogeography.

Data in table 1 should be reviewed because there are changes in the orders of fishes. For example, Holocentridae pertains to Holocentriformes and Carangidae to Carangiformes (See Froese and Pauly. 2023. FishBase. World Wide Web electronic publication. www.fishbase.org.version). In addition, I recommend reviewing the spelling of names; for example, Haemulon plumieri should be H. plumierii, and ordering the list of fishes. For this, I suggest reviewing Nelson et al. (2016) or Froese and Pauly (2023).

Discussion should be ordered according to results,

References should be standardized because some are capitalized and others are not. It is noteworthy that there is only one relatively recent reference (2015), and the others are older. I suggest including recent references in order to discuss your results.

Final considerations

I believe that there is little information for a zoogeographic analysis. Fish and fisheries data are the most robust that the authors have, so that should be the focus of discussion.

This paper can be published after a new review.