

Submission date. 14/05/2025

Associate editor's decision after peer review (21/07/2025).

Dear Dr. André:

Manuscript ID NI-2025-0086 entitled "Applying multi-mesh gillnet to monitor fish communities in neotropical rivers" which you submitted to the Neotropical Ichthyology, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

Based on the advice received, I have decided that your manuscript could be recommended for publication in Neotropical Ichthyology after you have carried out the corrections as suggested by the reviewers. Please consider revising the introduction and methods sections as indicated, as well as enhancing the figures and discussion section. I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc04.manuscriptcentral.com/ni-scielo> and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You may also click the below link to start the revision process (or continue the process if you have already started your revision) for your manuscript. If you use the below link you will not be required to login to ScholarOne Manuscripts.

*** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc04.manuscriptcentral.com/ni-scielo?URL_MASK=d2c26762d52a4433ada7838811794cb8

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or colored text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, upload BOTH versions (the tracked and a clean) and submit them through your Author Center.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please reply POINT TO POINT all the suggestions of the reviewers and be as specific as possible in your response to the comments.

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Neotropical Ichthyology, your revised manuscript should be submitted before 20-Sep-2025. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision by this date, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Neotropical Ichthyology and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,

Dr. Evelyn Habit

Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology

ehabit@udec.cl

Anonymous reviewer #1

Recommendation. Minor Revision

Comments. The manuscript "Applying multi-mesh gillnet to monitor fish

communities in neotropical rivers" demonstrates how the Nordic multi-mesh gillnet can serve as a valuable standardized tool for Neotropical river monitoring, providing reference selectivity curves that can aid other researchers in adjusting gillnet data in similar ecosystems. Overall, the manuscript is clear and well written. However, there are some typos, and the species names need to be standardized throughout the text and in the figures. See the file attached.

Anonymous reviewer #2

Recommendation. Minor Revision

Comments. I would like to congratulate the authors for this important and useful manuscript. I have specific comments to help better present and frame the ideas and results. The Introduction needs reformulation, mainly in the first paragraph, in order to better connect ideas. The Methods section could benefit from a better explanation of the samples, specifically the sampling effort applied, and the size and composition of the nets. Some information needs relocation. For example, information about species' economic, biological, and ecological relevance is misplaced in the Data Analysis section. In Results, some information is repeated or even presented without prior mention in Methods. A taxonomic update is also needed, both for species and orders. Figures require some improvement and, besides that, I was not able to fully visualize figures 3 and 4 completely — they were cut off in the PDF I received, which severely compromised the understanding of the results. Additionally, there is a very large amount of supplementary material with no explanation of its relevance. On the other hand, some essential content is presented in the supplementary material that should be included in the main manuscript. The Discussion has some repeated information that should be suppressed, and in general, it could be more concise. Also, I believe the conclusion suggesting that the Nordic multi-mesh is not efficient for large fish needs better support to demonstrate that this is not just a consequence of mesh sizes selected by the authors. Finally, the arguments regarding the relevance of monitoring seem superficial and need improvement.

More specific comments are provided below:

Abstract

(Lines 11–13) I believe that this sentence could be simplified. Consider something like: "Species were captured ... from small to large (5–55 mm)" –

Introduction

(pg 4, lines 11–12) – I believe it would be a good idea to point out that it is widely used in some regions, but not worldwide, as authors stated, it is not common in South America.

(pg 4, lines 19–20) – "which harbor over..." – This sentence seems out of context. Consider relocation.

(pg 4, lines 21–22) – I suggest authors consider to initiate a new paragraph beginning with the sentence 'Neotropical fish communities are...'.
(pg 4, line 25) – "Recent studies" once again introduces a different subject disconnected from the previous one.

(pg 4, lines 28–29) – "this underscores the urgent need..." – I don't think the decline of Neotropical fishes automatically underscores an urgent need for multi-mesh monitoring. If the authors wish to keep this sentence, they should develop the reasoning more clearly.

(pg 5, lines 22–29) – I understand that Siluriformes can be the richest order in some neotropical basins, but this is also due to the high endemism of small Trichomycteridae and Hypoptopomatinae in small streams — which are barely sampled by gillnets. Instead of stating that Siluriformes dominate always, I suggest that they has greater richness and abundance together with Characiformes

Neotropical Ichthyology



This is an open access Peer Review File under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. In cases where reviewers are anonymous, credit should be given to 'Anonymous Referee' and the source.

Distributed under
Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0

© 2026 The Authors.
Diversity and Distributions Published by SBI



Official Journal of the
Sociedade Brasileira de Ictiologia



Official Journal of the
Sociedade Brasileira de Ictiologia

(pg 5, lines 45–46) – Are “contact selectivity curves” a specific method? Please, clarify.
 (pg 6, lines 25–35) – This sentence belongs in the Methods section; I think it is not necessary here.

Methods

(pg 6, line 48) – I suggest to use “drainage area” or “basin area” of 365,000 km², instead of only ‘area’.

(pg 6, lines 52–56) – Why was Moi et al. cited here? Also, I suggest removing the commas in “40 km, of the lower...”.

Figure 1 – Is Las Canas located at the confluence of the Uruguay with the Paraná River? Also, a photo of this site is missing from the figure.

(pg 7, line 6) – I believe more appropriate to report the month of sampling rather than the season.

(pg 7, lines 12–14) – Why did two sets of nets make four 60-meter long sets? This is unclear for me. Please, consider rephrasing. This section would also benefit from informing the area of the nets (in m²), as this was used in the analysis.

(pg 7, lines 21–22) – What time (or period) were the nets deployed and removed?

(pg 7, lines 28–31) – This could be simplified - Understood that authors noted in what mesh size each fish was captured.

(pg 7, lines 38–39) – “Uncommon fish were excluded to avoid uncommon fish” – This sentence is redundant.

(pg 7, line 42) – A taxonomic update is needed: for instance, *Bryconamericus stramineus* is currently valid as *Piabarchus stramineus*.

(pg 7, lines 48–58) – I believe this information about the species is out of context here; it is unrelated to the previous paragraph and not part of Data Analysis.

(pg 8, lines 6–7) – I suggest to insert the citation of the package instead of mentioning the author and link. I also didn't understand the meaning of the phrase in parentheses: “(Share each ...)”.

(pg 8, lines 14–15) – I suggest to better explain the information in this sentence: Gamma, Log-normal, etc, are distribution types. Is it correct?

(pg 8, lines 15–19) – I was not able to understand this sentence. Also, what does “spread” mean in this context (in parentheses)?

(pg 8, lines 22–23) – What are “gillnet variants”?

(pg 8, lines 24–26) – Could authors explain why this information is important for the analysis?

(pg 8, lines 24–26) – I think it is more appropriate to indicate the size class ranges and the criteria used for division. Were they equally distributed by millimeters, or based on the number of fish per class?

Results

(pg 9, lines 22–28) – What were the other species and orders? Additionally, This information is repeated. The authors should choose one section in which to present it.

(pg 9, lines 32–34) – “All combinations of mesh sizes...” – What does “combinations” mean here? This information is new; I did not see it in the Methods section.

Table 1 – Perciformes are mentioned — is this due to *Pachyurus*? If so, a taxonomic update is required: *Pachyurus* is currently classified as *Acanthuriformes* according to Catalog of Fishes (Fricke et al. 2025). Also, was the presence of more than 60 individuals, mentioned in the table caption, the criterion for species selection? If so, this must be added to the text.

Table 2 – Could present the number of individuals per species. I believe this is important for evaluating model parameters.

Figure 2 – I am not sure “community size” is the best label for the Y-axis — it resembles species richness. Perhaps “fish size” would be better. Also, positioning all mesh sizes on the X-axis might improve clarity compared to the current format, which is a bit confusing.

(pg 9, lines 38–40) – I recommend summarizing the information from Table 2 in a sentence and citing it appropriately '(Table 2)'. The second sentence ("The best fitting model...") fits better in this context. Additionally, the large amount of supplementary material mentioned (Table S4, pages 39–155) seems excessive, as the authors did not provide a meaningful discussion of it in the manuscript. Would it be possible to summarize this material?

Figures 3 and 4 – I was not able to fully visualize these figures. Almost half of them are cut off in the PDF I received.

(pg 9, lines 46–47) – "The normal location (fixed spread) ..." – Why is this relevant to the manuscript's aims? I think this information needs more context. The same applies to the sentence "the log-normal model...".

(pg 10, line 3) – Would "similar" be more appropriate than "close"?

(pg 10, line 27) – "Comparing... (rel Si, Table S2)" – This seems to be an essential result supported by supplementary material. I correct, I suggest including this information in the main manuscript rather than in the supplement.

Table S1 – Again, I suggest a taxonomic review; for example, *Crenicichla missionera* belongs now to Cichliformes order. Also, please use 'Characiformes', 'Siluriformes', etc.

Discussion

(pg 10, lines 49–57) – "This type of multi-mesh..." – It seems to me more appropriate in the Introduction.

(pg 10, line 57 – pg 11, line 3) – This sentence is confusing; I did not understand it.

(pg 11, lines 12–14) – What does "we corrected using the overall..." mean? Please, clarify.

(pg 11, lines 9–19) – Several ideas are presented here in a confusing or even contradictory way. I suggest rephrasing these sentences.

(pg 11, lines 37–38) – So, I understand that the difficulty in sampling larger fishes is not related to the Nordic multimesh gillnets themselves, but rather to the mesh sizes chosen by the authors. Also, why was a 1.25 ratio used? Perhaps this information should be presented earlier in the Results section to be discussed here.

(pg 11, line 58 – pg 12, line 8) – It seems me a series of sentences describing information that belongs to another sections, specially Results. I think that "evidenced when deviance..." belongs in Methods. Scientific names of fish must be italicized.

(pg 12, lines 38–56) – There is no need to repeat which species belong to each order again; this was already stated. Also, the information that siluriformes were the most abundant is also repeated.

(pg 14, lines 5–7) – I'm not convinced that the Nordic multi-mesh is inefficient for large fish. It seems possible that this is simply a consequence of the mesh sizes selected. Please, clarify this issue in the manuscript.

Author's Rebuttal Letter (12/09/2025).

To: Evelyn Habit, Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology

Subject: Revision of Applying multi-mesh gillnet to monitor fish communities in Neotropical rivers

We are pleased to present a thoroughly revised manuscript entitled "Applying multi-mesh gillnet to monitor fish communities in neotropical rivers" to be considered for publication in Neotropical Ichthyology.

We appreciate the constructive comments and suggestions of the two Reviewers, who have strengthened our manuscript. To meet Reviewers' suggestions, we (i) carefully revised the names of the species, as suggested by Reviewer 1, and (ii) carefully revised the introduction, methods, and results following the reviewer's suggestions 2.

We are submitting clean and tracked change files that include all the changes made.

"As we sent tables and figures in the response letter, we are sending a Word file with a

detailed response to each comment from the reviewers.”

Associate editor's decision after peer review (12/10/2025).

Dear Dr. André:

Manuscript ID NI-2025-0086.R1 entitled "Applying multi-mesh gillnet to monitor fish communities in neotropical rivers" which you submitted to the Neotropical Ichthyology, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc04.manuscriptcentral.com/ni-scielo> and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You may also click the below link to start the revision process (or continue the process if you have already started your revision) for your manuscript. If you use the below link you will not be required to login to ScholarOne Manuscripts.

*** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc04.manuscriptcentral.com/ni-scielo?URL_MASK=b5a2e62338ac49fa81e5484bf87e6cb9

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or colored text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, upload BOTH versions (the tracked and a clean) and submit them through your Author Center.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please reply POINT TO POINT all the suggestions of the reviewers and be as specific as possible in your response to the comments.

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Neotropical Ichthyology, your revised manuscript should be submitted before 12-Nov-2025. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision by this date, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Neotropical Ichthyology and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,

Dr. Evelyn Habit

Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology

ehabit@udec.cl

Anonymous reviewer #1

Recommendation. Minor Revision

Comments. I would like to congratulate the authors on the significant improvements made to the manuscript. Unnecessary information has been removed from the introduction and discussion sections, resulting in a clearer text. The methods and results sections are now better explained, more direct, and free of repetition. However, there are minor details that still need attention, such as standardizing the terms

"Figure" and "Fig." and translating Table 1 into English. See the attachment.

Anonymous reviewer #2

Recommendation. Minor Revision

Comments. (There are no comments.)

Author's Rebuttal Letter (09/11/2025).

To: Evelyn Habit, Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology

Subject: Revision of Applying multi-mesh gillnet to monitor fish communities in neotropical rivers

We are pleased to present a thoroughly revisited manuscript entitled "Applying multi-mesh gillnet to monitor fish communities in neotropical rivers" to be considered for publication in Neotropical Ichthyology.

We appreciate the constructive comments and suggestions of the two Reviewers, who have strengthened our manuscript.

Detailed replies to the Reviewers are provided below, with our point-by-point responses in bold.

We sincerely hope the revised manuscript is suitable for publication in Neotropical Ichthyology.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Dieison André Moi, on behalf of all authors.

Associate editor's decision after peer review (20/11/2025).

Dear Dr. André:

Manuscript ID NI-2025-0086.R2 entitled "Applying multi-mesh gillnet to monitor fish communities in neotropical rivers" which you submitted to the Neotropical Ichthyology, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc04.manuscriptcentral.com/ni-scielo> and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You may also click the below link to start the revision process (or continue the process if you have already started your revision) for your manuscript. If you use the below link you will not be required to login to ScholarOne Manuscripts.

*** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc04.manuscriptcentral.com/ni-scielo?URL_MASK=43975a9883854b1e8377cea66a868ef9

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or colored text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, upload BOTH versions (the tracked and a clean) and submit them through your Author Center.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please reply POINT TO POINT all the suggestions of the

reviewers and be as specific as possible in your response to the comments.
IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission. Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Neotropical Ichthyology, your revised manuscript should be submitted before 21-Dec-2025. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision by this date, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.
Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Neotropical Ichthyology and I look forward to receiving your revision.
Sincerely,
Dr. Evelyn Habit
Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology
ehabit@udec.cl

Anonymous reviewer #1

Recommendation. Minor Revision

Comments. General comments

Most of the comments were addressed by the authors, and I now have only a few suggestions.

I still think the manuscript would benefit from better connecting the ideas of freshwater fish threats and the need for long-term monitoring — briefly stating how the latter is important for addressing the former.

Additionally, my main doubt (whether the mesh sizes were evenly distributed among sampling campaigns) was satisfactorily answered. As I understood, each sampling event used eight replicates of a complete Nordic multimesh gillnet. According to my understanding, the confusion arose due to the use of different terminology: initially, the authors mention “complete Nordic multimesh gillnet,” and later refer simply to “net.”

If I am correct in this observation — and since this is a relatively new method for many researchers in South America — I suggest standardizing the terminology, consistently using Nordic multimesh gillnet, Nordic net, or another preferred term, but always in a uniform way to distinguish these from common gillnets and avoid misinterpretation.

Please find my detailed comments below.

Summary

Could be improved by linking the first idea (freshwater fish declines facing human threats) with the need for long-term monitoring. Please briefly state why the second is important in relation to the first.

Introduction

(Pg 4, line 6 onward): Same issue: I miss a clear link between the first sentence (freshwater ecosystem threats) and the second (long-term monitoring needs). I know this connection is important, but the paragraph lacks cohesion between ideas.

Additionally, the first sentence of the Abstract focuses on fish, while the first sentence of the Introduction mentions “freshwater ecosystems” and “monitoring freshwater biota.” I suggest standardizing this. It may be more appropriate to focus on fish, as done in the abstract and throughout the rest of the manuscript.

Additionally, I'm still missing a link between the first sentence (“Freshwater ecosystems are increasingly threatened...”) and the second (“Hence, standardized long-term monitoring of freshwater biota...”). These ideas would benefit from a clearer connection.

(Pg 4, line 22 onward): The same issue applies here: the connection is still missing between the first sentence — about assemblages dominated by Characiformes and Siluriformes — and the second sentence — which introduces the need to establish standardized methods.

The authors need to clarify how these ideas are conceptually connected.

Methods

(Pg 7, lines 7–22): The authors mention “eight individual nets,” which I now assume means that “net” refers to a complete Nordic multimesh gillnet with 12 mesh sizes. However, referring to the Nordic multimesh size net simply as “net” can lead to confusion. In the first version, I truly thought “net” referred to a common gillnet with a single mesh size.

Therefore, I suggest using another term to clearly distinguish nordic nets from common gillnets (see my suggestion in the General Comments).

In addition, the authors mention “four sets composed of two nets each.” As I understand it, two nets were positioned close to the riverbanks and two more distant. However, Figure 1 shows only two rectangles. Does that mean each rectangle represents two sets, with two Nordic multimesh gillnets each?

If I am correct, please clarify this in both the Methods section and the Figure 1 legend. Every time “net” refers to a Nordic multimesh gillnet, a standardized term should be used — or, if the authors prefer, clearly state early on that “net” will refer to a Nordic multimesh gillnet with 12 mesh sizes.

Figure 1: The authors mention four sets with two Nordic multimesh gillnets, but the figure shows only two rectangles. Please specify if each rectangle represents four Nordic multimesh gillnets (assuming I understood correctly and that this is accurate). Additionally, instead of the vague expression “full set of nets”, clearly state what it means — e.g., how many Nordic nets were deployed in each sampling.

(Pg 7, line 21): Why 46 trials, if there were two samples per year over 7 years? What means the ‘trials’?

(Pg 7, line 22): Remove the parenthesis “(i.e., two samples per year)” — it repeats the information given on page 6, line 55.

Discussion

Regarding my previous comment:

- Query #25 – (pg 10, line 47) “In general...” – Another new paragraph in my opinion. There are three different issues in the same paragraph.
- Reply #25 – We respectfully disagree; this is an introductory paragraph to the discussion that shows the main results. It would not make sense to create a paragraph for each sentence.

I agree with the authors — it is completely valid to open the Discussion with a paragraph that introduces the main results.

However, this paragraph is currently almost one full manuscript page in length. Please make sure it is much more concise than the current version. Three or four sentences are sufficient. What doesn’t make sense is having an introductory paragraph that is nearly as long as the entire Results section. This paragraph should serve as a brief summary of the main findings.

Anonymous reviewer #2

Recommendation. Minor Revision

Comments. The manuscript has significant improvements in the text, making it clearer. There are still a few minimal details that need to be fixed, for example, Table 1 is in Portuguese, a lack of standardization of “Figure” and “Fig.” The manuscript has notable improvements, enhancing clarity. However, there are a few minor details that still need to be addressed (see comments below).

Pg 6. Line 48. Replace “Figure 1” with “Fig. 1”

Pg 11. A space is missing

Pg 18. Line 32. Replace “[” with “:”

Pg 18. Line 36. Start “Fig. 3” in a new line.

Pg 19. Line 14. The top of the table is in Portuguese.

Author's Rebuttal Letter (17/12/2025).

To: Evelyn Habit, Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology

Subject: Revision of Applying multi-mesh gillnet to monitor fish communities in Neotropical rivers

We are pleased to present a thoroughly revisited manuscript entitled “Applying multi-mesh gillnet to monitor fish communities in neotropical rivers” to be considered for publication in Neotropical Ichthyology.

We appreciate the constructive comments and suggestions of the Reviewer, who have strengthened our manuscript.

Detailed replies to the Reviewer are provided below, with our point-by-point responses in bold.

We sincerely hope the revised manuscript is suitable for publication in Neotropical Ichthyology.

Yours sincerely,

Dieison André Moi, on behalf of all authors.

Reviewer #1 comments

Query #1 – Most of the comments were addressed by the authors, and I now have only a few suggestions.

I still think the manuscript would benefit from better connecting the ideas of freshwater fish threats and the need for long-term monitoring — briefly stating how the latter is important for addressing the former.

Additionally, my main doubt (whether the mesh sizes were evenly distributed among sampling campaigns) was satisfactorily answered. As I understood, each sampling event used eight replicates of a complete Nordic multimesh gillnet. According to my understanding, the confusion arose due to the use of different terminology: initially, the authors mention “complete Nordic multimesh gillnet,” and later refer simply to “net.”

If I am correct in this observation — and since this is a relatively new method for many researchers in South America — I suggest standardizing the terminology, consistently using Nordic multimesh gillnet, Nordic net, or another preferred term, but always in a uniform way to distinguish these from common gillnets and avoid misinterpretation.

Please find my detailed comments below.

Response #1 – Using the reviewer’s comments and suggestions, we revised the Methods section to clearly state that only Nordic multi-mesh gillnets were used. We also rewrote the first paragraph of the Discussion to make it more concise and direct. We are deeply grateful for the reviewer’s thorough assessment and constructive input, which substantially improved the manuscript.

Query #2 – Could be improved by linking the first idea (freshwater fish declines facing human threats) with the need for long-term monitoring. Please briefly state why the second is important in relation to the first.

Response #2 – As suggested by the reviewer, we rewrote these sentences to make them more connected and coherent.

“Neotropical fish diversity has been declining, driven by increasing human pressures. This accelerating loss underscores the urgent need for standardized methods capable of reliably monitoring these communities” (Page 2, Line 2-4; clean document).

Query #3 – (Pg 4, line 6 onward): Same issue: I miss a clear link between the first sentence (freshwater ecosystem threats) and the second (long-term monitoring needs). I know this connection is important, but the paragraph lacks cohesion between ideas. Additionally, the first sentence of the Abstract focuses on fish, while the first sentence

of the Introduction mentions “freshwater ecosystems” and “monitoring freshwater biota.” I suggest standardizing this. It may be more appropriate to focus on fish, as done in the abstract and throughout the rest of the manuscript.

Reply #3 – We agree with the reviewer that the first paragraph of the introduction could be better written. Therefore, we revised the entire paragraph and focused on neotropical fish to make the manuscript more cohesive.

“Neotropical freshwater fish are increasingly threatened by anthropogenic pressures, including pollution, biological invasions, and overfishing (Shantz et al., 2019; Pelicice et al., 2021; Moi et al., 2025). Considering the accelerated decline in the diversity of these assemblages, standardized long-term monitoring has become essential (Magurran et al., 2010). In this context, multi-mesh gillnets are among the most widely used standardized sampling tools in some regions, such as Europe (Millar and Holst, 1997; Carol and García-Berthou, 2007)” (Page 4, Line 2-10; clean document).

Query #4 – Additionally, I’m still missing a link between the first sentence (“Freshwater ecosystems are increasingly threatened...”) and the second (“Hence, standardized long-term monitoring of freshwater biota...”). These ideas would benefit from a clearer connection. (Pg 4, line 22 onward): The same issue applies here: the connection is still missing between the first sentence — about assemblages dominated by Characiformes and Siluriformes — and the second sentence — which introduces the need to establish standardized methods.

Reply #4 – We rewrote the first paragraph to make the sentences more connected.

“Neotropical freshwater fish are increasingly threatened by anthropogenic pressures, including pollution, biological invasions, and overfishing (Shantz et al., 2019; Pelicice et al., 2021; Moi et al., 2025). Considering the accelerated decline in the diversity of these assemblages, standardized long-term monitoring has become essential (Magurran et al., 2010). In this context, multi-mesh gillnets are among the most widely used standardized sampling tools in some regions, such as Europe (Millar and Holst, 1997; Carol and García-Berthou, 2007)” (Page 4, Line 2-10; clean document). In addition, we also revised the second paragraph of the introduction to make the ideas more connected.

“Neotropical freshwaters harbor more than 4,200 fish species (Tonella et al., 2023). Neotropical fish assemblages are highly diverse and are dominated by Characiformes and Siluriformes, which exhibit a broad range of body sizes and morphological traits (Albert et al., 2020). Given this highly diverse taxonomic and functional structure, combined with the intensification of anthropogenic pressures, it is necessary to establish standardized gillnet-based methods capable of assessing catch-length distributions, population size structure, and species abundance in Neotropical fish assemblages, while also enabling evaluations of anthropogenic impacts (Moi et al., 2024, 2025)” (Page 4, Line 11-21; clean document).

Query #5 – (Pg 7, lines 7–22): The authors mention “eight individual nets,” which I now assume means that “net” refers to a complete Nordic multimesh gillnet with 12 mesh sizes. However, referring to the Nordic multimesh size net simply as “net” can lead to confusion. In the first version, I truly thought “net” referred to a common gillnet with a single mesh size. Therefore, I suggest using another term to clearly distinguish nordic nets from common gillnets (see my suggestion in the General Comments).

Reply#5 – We agree with the reviewer that using nets can lead to confusion. Therefore, we have standardised the term ‘Nordic multi-mesh gillnet’ throughout the manuscript.

Query #6 – In addition, the authors mention “four sets composed of two nets each.” As I understand it, two nets were positioned close to the riverbanks and two more distant. However, Figure 1 shows only two rectangles. Does that mean each rectangle represents two sets, with two Nordic multimesh gillnets each? If I am correct, please

clarify this in both the Methods section and the Figure 1 legend. Every time “net” refers to a Nordic multimesh gillnet, a standardized term should be used — or, if the authors prefer, clearly state early on that “net” will refer to a Nordic multimesh gillnet with 12 mesh sizes.

Reply #6 – Yes, four sets consisting of two Nordic multi-mesh gillnets each were used. Figure 1 shows the four rectangles (see the collection sites on the left side of the figure). At each of the three monitored locations (i.e., Nuevo Berlin, Fray Bentos, and Las Cañas), there are four rectangles, representing two sets of Nordic multi-mesh gillnets placed perpendicular to each other, totalling eight nets per collection site. In addition, we revised the text to make it clear that ‘nets’ refers to Nordic multi-mesh gillnets.

Query #7– Figure 1: The authors mention four sets with two Nordic multimesh gillnets, but the figure shows only two rectangles. Please specify if each rectangle represents four Nordic multimesh gillnets (assuming I understood correctly and that this is accurate). Additionally, instead of the vague expression “full set of nets”, clearly state what it means — e.g., how many Nordic nets were deployed in each sampling.

Reply #7 – There seems to be some misinterpretation of Figure 1. In fact, the figure clearly shows four rectangles. If the reviewer looks closely at the right side of Figure 1 (at the sampling sites: Nuevo Berlin, Fray Bentos, and Las Cañas), four white rectangles are clearly shown, representing the exact collection site where the two sets of nets were placed.

We respectfully request that the reviewer check the figure again. It is possible that the figure was distorted when sent to the reviewer and that some information was lost. However, we assure you that there are exactly four rectangles in the figure.

Query #8 – (Pg 7, line 21): Why 46 trials, if there were two samples per year over 7 years? What means the ‘trials’?

Reply #8 – Thank you for the comment. We have added more information, as this point was not clearly explained. During the 8-year monitoring period, with two sampling events per year at three sites, a total of 48 sampling events were conducted ($8 \times 2 \times 3 = 48$). In each of these events, one Nordic multi-mesh gillnet was randomly selected for the selectivity analysis, in which fish were quantified by mesh-size class. Unfortunately, two sampling events were lost, so the final number of nets used for the selectivity analysis was 46 Nordic multi-mesh gillnets. We reviewed the text as: “Nordic multi-mesh gillnets were deployed from 7 p.m. to 7 a.m., covering approximately 12 hours during the twilight and night period. For this study, fish caught in 46 nordic multi-mesh gillnets were analysed. This number corresponds to selecting one Nordic multi-mesh gillnet per sampling event. During the 8-year monitoring period (2009–2016), 48 sampling events were planned (two per year at three sites), with one Nordic multi-mesh gillnet randomly selected in each event for the selectivity analysis. Two events were lost, resulting in 46 gillnets, which together represent a total sampled gillnet area of 2,070 m² across autumn and spring campaigns” (Page 7, Line 5-12; clean document).

Query #9– (Pg 7, line 22): Remove the parenthesis “(i.e., two samples per year)” — it repeats the information given on page 6, line 55.

Reply #9 – Done.

Query #10 – Query #25 – (pg 10, line 47) “In general...” – Another new paragraph in my opinion. There are three different issues in the same paragraph.

• Reply #25 – We respectfully disagree; this is an introductory paragraph to the discussion that shows the main results. It would not make sense to create a paragraph for each sentence.

I agree with the authors — it is completely valid to open the Discussion with a paragraph that introduces the main results. However, this paragraph is currently almost one full manuscript page in length. Please make sure it is much more concise

than the current version. Three or four sentences are sufficient. What doesn't make sense is having an introductory paragraph that is nearly as long as the entire Results section. This paragraph should serve as a brief summary of the main findings.

Reply #10 – As suggested by the reviewer, we have substantially reduced the size of the first discussion paragraph to make it more concise.

“Based on monitoring data, this study evaluated the selectivity of the 'Nordic multi-mesh gillnet' for 14 fish species along the Río Uruguay. We found that Siluriformes and Characiformes were the most commonly captured orders, matching their high abundance in Neotropical fish assemblages (Albert et al., 2020; Tonella et al., 2023). In general, fish length increased with mesh size (Fig. 2), highlighting the size selectivity of the Nordic multi-mesh gillnet. Different selectivity models were more suitable for different species, indicating that model performance is species-specific (Millar, Fryer, 1999; Carol, García-Berthou, 2007; Tesfay et al., 2016). Several Siluriformes species showed evidence of size bias, which was corrected using overall selectivity curves (adjusted by Rel SI) following Shoup and Ryswyk (2016). These findings indicate that the Nordic multi-mesh gillnet may be effectively used for monitoring fish stocks in Neotropical rivers, although size biases may occur for Siluriformes” (Page 10, Line 10-22; clean document).

Associate editor's decision after peer review (21/01/2026).

Dear Dr. André:

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript entitled "Applying multi-mesh gillnet to monitor fish communities in neotropical rivers" in its current form for publication in the Neotropical Ichthyology. Neither the reviewer nor I have additional comments. Congratulations for the acceptance of your article, and be aware on the following topics:

1. Publication Fee

NI will charge a publication fee if none of the co-authors is an active SBI member. This measure is essential to strengthen SBI and thus ensure the continuity of our journal, scientific society, and biannual meetings. SBI is not limited to Brazilians but is open to anyone interested in freshwater and marine Neotropical fishes. More details on SBI are available at <https://www.sbi.bio.br/>. Please email tesouraria.sbi@gmail.com to confirm whether any of your co-authors is a current SBI member and to activate your SBI membership if needed. Otherwise, if you will cover the publication fee of R\$1.000, please inform us at the same email. For authors outside Brazil, the fee will be converted to US dollars based on the official exchange rate on the date of payment. The only exceptions to this fee are invited articles.

2. Science Communication and Social Media

NI actively promotes published articles to both academic colleagues and the general public, including science journalists. To support this, we create social media posts and require images and/or videos of fish related to your work. If your article does not include such images, please send a photo of a representative fish species, preferably alive in its natural habitat. If you do not have your own photo, you may provide a link to an online image, along with the source, author, and, if applicable, authorization for its use. We also publish video summaries of articles in Portuguese on our Instagram (@neoichth). We ask you to designate one author to record a short video using a mobile phone, following the attached instructions. The video should include visual materials (photos, graphics) and a script for subtitles to enhance accessibility. Please email the completed material to neoichth@nupelia.uem.br within 30 days. For now, please provide the name and email address of the author responsible for recording the video. Additionally, if your article is taxonomic in nature and has been submitted to Zoobank, it is your responsibility to update the manuscript's status on Zoobank once it has been published.

All of the above information and materials are mandatory for the publication of your article, including the scientific dissemination component, which is crucial in the current climate of science denial and misinformation. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us at neoichth@nupelia.uem.br.

Please respond to this e-mail within five working days to let us know you are aware of all the important points mentioned above.

Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of the Neotropical Ichthyology, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Sincerely,

Dr. Evelyn Habit

Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology

ehabit@udec.cl

Neotropical Ichthyology

OPEN ACCESS



This is an open access Peer Review File under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. In cases where reviewers are anonymous, credit should be given to 'Anonymous Referee' and the source.

Distributed under
Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0

© 2026 The Authors.
Diversity and Distributions Published by SBI

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

- **Moi DA, D'Anatro A, González-Bergonzoni I, Teixeira-de-Mello F.** Applying multi-mesh gillnet to monitor fish communities in neotropical rivers. *Neotrop Ichthyol.* 2026; 24(1):e250086. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-0224-2025-0086>



Official Journal of the
Sociedade Brasileira de Ictiologia