

Submission date. 13/08/2025

Associate editor's decision after peer review (18/11/2025).

Dear Dr. Tencatt:

Manuscript ID NI-2025-0146 entitled "A new Corydoras (Siluriformes: Callichthyidae) from the rio Tefé basin, Brazilian Amazon, with comments on the taxonomic status of Corydoras orcesi and a discussion on the mouth morphology in Corydoradinae" 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=39f7b6bc9cc84c13b26734cd9176f88c

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, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) 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 be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s). 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 19-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. Bruno Melo

Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology

brunfmelo@gmail.com

Entire Scoresheet:

Associate Editor: I agree with both reviewers that the paper looks good and is well detailed. I also follow them in the case of the length of the Discussion that seems too long for the NI reader; highly recommend reducing the size and content. I also suggest the inclusion of a separate shapefile for the main Amazonas channel that discriminates it from the other tributaries. Please provide catalog numbers for paratypes. Note the

two PDFs for both reviewers; let me know in case you can't see them. Thanks for your contribution, and I'm looking forward to seeing the revised version.

Anonymous reviewer #1

Recommendation. Minor Revision

Comments. The manuscript is a good one, describing a new species of *Corydoras* from the Rio Tefé. It is well researched and well written. The diagnosis is good and demonstrates that the fish indeed represents an undescribed lineage.

Several small suggestions were penciled directly on a copy of the ms, that goes attached, and are not repeated here.

General:

The text seems to be too long sometimes... the authors could try to write more concisely and shorten the text in various places, especially in Discussion.

The authors use “present” a lot, with the meaning of having or possessing. I suggest replacing “present” with “has, have, possess, possesses” in most instances.

Page/line:

8/46 and 48: Add collection numbers.

18/8: What are “adipose-fin membrane platelets”? The fish has platelets on the adipose-fin membrane? Never seen that! Please revise in case they don't.

Great paper!

R. Reis

Anonymous reviewer #2

Recommendation. Accept

Comments. The work is well written and presents clear morphological information; the references are recent and appropriate. The taxonomic justification is coherent, and the species diagnosis is well structured, although lengthy. The figures are clear and self-explanatory. The revision of *pastazensis* and *orcesi* is very pertinent and necessary, and the discussion on the homology of the barbel is innovative. The manuscript is detailed, with excellent osteological documentation. Overall, the manuscript is extremely solid and is recommended for publication; however, the discussion could be more concise (it is long and somewhat tiring).

** The application was unable to attach manuscript files to this email, because one or more of the files exceeded the allowable attachment size (6MB). **

Author's Rebuttal Letter (24/11/2025).

We hereby submit a reviewed version of the manuscript now entitled “A new *Corydoras* (Siluriformes: Callichthyidae) from the rio Tefé basin, Brazilian Amazon, with comments on the taxonomic status of *Corydoras orcesi* and a discussion on the mouth morphology in *Corydoradinae*”, NI-2025-0146, by Luiz Fernando Caserta Tencatt, Alexandre Pucci Hercos, Vandergleison de Carvalho, Sérgio A. Santos and Marcelo Britto. Regarding the attached file, all comments/suggestions by the reviewers were all related to ‘style issues’, which were mostly accepted. Below we address all the comments by the reviewers:

Comments:

The text seems to be too long sometimes... the authors could try to write more concisely and shorten the text in various places, especially in Discussion.

R: We understand that the size of the paper became a bit long, however, we need “space” to present, describe and discuss each of the characters proposed in this study. Also, the taxonomic story of the related species is not simple, which is why our discussion became long. However, we think it's necessary to do proper explanations on each of the new and previous characters related to mouth, as well as the new homology proposed for barbels. This is also valid for the only main comment of Reviewer 2. We ask to

keep the discussion as it is for clarity purposes. Moreover, considering that the the names *C. pastazensis* and *C. orcesi* appeared in Alexandrou et al. (2011) as two distinct species, we found necessary to add paragraph to explain that such identifications are incorrect. With that, we also had to add another figure. This reinforces our hypothesis of synonymy. Again, such studies with broader analysis need to be deeply discussed.

The authors use “present” a lot, with the meaning of having or possessing. I suggest replacing “present” with “has, have, possess, possesses” in most instances.

R: Ok, done.

Page/line:

8/46 and 48: Add collection numbers.

R: Ok, done.

18/8: What are “adipose-fin membrane platelets”? The fish has platelets on the adipose-fin membrane? Never seen that! Please revise in case they don't.

R: It was a mistake, we erased “platelets” from the sentence.

Regarding the comment related to the use of subspecific names, as the reviewer said, the ICZN makes a recommendation, but this is not mandatory. In our view, it is important to mention the subspecies in our explanation to make it more clear when we are talking about each entity.

Thank you in advance

Kind regards

The authors

Associate editor's decision after peer review (02/12/2025).

Dear Dr. Tencatt:

Manuscript ID NI-2025-0146.R1 entitled "A new *Corydoras* (Siluriformes: Callichthyidae) from the rio Tefé basin, Brazilian Amazon, with comments on the taxonomic status of *Corydoras orcesi* and a discussion on the mouth morphology in *Corydoradinae*" 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 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=7422b417f3ab45bd92a6925c38998b1d

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 01-Feb-2026. 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. Bruno Melo

Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology

brunfmelo@gmail.com

Entire Scoresheet:

Associate Editor: Dear authors,

I cannot proceed with a second round of review because authors have not attended to important comments of both reviewers regarding the length of the Discussion. This is a strong recommendation of peer reviewers that other readers will probably detect when reading your manuscript. Importantly, we at NI follow the recommendations of all our reviewers and are very grateful for their time and free-of-charge hard work evaluating manuscripts, as many of you are also reviewers. Considering that both reviewers were positive for later publication, I encourage authors to revise the manuscript and synthesize sections of long discussions of their results. Other long monographs are encouraged to be published separately.

Let me know if you have questions.

Bruno

Author's Rebuttal Letter (03/12//2025).

Dear editor and reviewers,

So, firstly, I respectfully address the point raised by the reviewers regarding the length of the discussion. I emphasize that we do respect the reviewers' point of view, which was addressed in our previous response letter. But I hope to attend to your suggestion without pauperize our work.

Our work is divided in 5 axes, which are (1) a species is described, (2) a species is synonymized, (3) phylogenetic characters available in the literature are re-evaluated/reformulated, (4) a new homology proposal for barbels is provided, and (5) new characters are proposed and described. Considering this, it becomes quite complicated to do all this in a small space. We do not consider our discussion verbose or repetitive, but we understand that a more objective approach may add to the work. Considering this, we moved some paragraphs to the Remarks section, where they seem to fit better, leaving only the character analyses axis as the Discussion section. However, removing any information from the work would impoverish it, in our view. I've always seen NI as a space for us to do this kind of work, which goes beyond a straightforward species description. And the plan is to continue like this, making descriptions that offer much more than just new names. Therefore, considering the 5 axes included in our work, we consider that a total of about 60 pages of raw text (which will be surely reduced to 40, 45 pages with text and figures in the final PDF form, at least following NI's pattern in our last contributions; ~25% reduction from raw to final form), we think that the size of the manuscript itself is compatible with its contents.

I kindly ask that you think about this and consider our new version suitable for NI.

Thank you all in advance, editors, reviewers, NI is where I deposit practically everything I produce precisely because I am certain of your seriousness and professionalism.

kind regards
Luiz

Associate editor's decision after peer review (07/01/2026).

Dear Dr. Tencatt:

Manuscript ID NI-2025-0146.R2 entitled "A new Corydoras (Siluriformes: Callichthyidae) from the rio Tefé basin, Brazilian Amazon, with comments on the taxonomic status of Corydoras orcesi and a discussion on the mouth morphology in Corydoradinae" 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=c607181a414f4dc183b2e4a007c779fe

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 07-Feb-2026. 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. Bruno Melo

Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology
brunfmelo@gmail.com

Anonymous reviewer #1

Recommendation. Minor Revision

Comments. This is an excellent contribution, as it presents the description of a new species of Corydoras, with detailed descriptions and illustrations, and discusses some of the main features in a broader context. The text is generally well written, except for

the frequent use of the expression “Regarding this...”, which should be avoided and the sentences rewritten in a more direct manner. In addition, expressions used to give emphasis or to amplify statements in an imprecise way should be avoided.

Abstract. It is not clear to readers who read only the Abstract why the two nominal species (*Corydoras pastazensis* and *C. pastazensis orcesi*) were included in the study. A clearer link should be established between the new species and these two taxa.

Introduction. The Introduction is effective in presenting the rationale for the present study, except for one detail. Specimens identified in the aquarium literature as CW128 and CW207 are mentioned at the beginning of the Introduction, but the authors do not explicitly state their identity, whether they belong to the new species described here, to *Corydoras pastazensis*, or to another species. This information is provided only in the Results section. However, the authors should include in the Introduction their initial hypotheses regarding these specimens, which are then confirmed (or not) in the Results and Discussion. Or alternatively delete this information from the Introduction. Material and Methods are detailed and comprehensive.

Results follow the NI format, with a comparative diagnosis based on color pattern and, as far as I can tell, including all congeners. The description is comprehensive, including well-illustrated osteological features and a detailed account of coloration. The remarks are especially informative regarding the taxonomy of *Corydoras* species other than the new species.

Discussion is interesting and detailed, and provides new interpretations of morphological characters related to the mouth and barbels that will be helpful for future contributions. However, the section is overly long and contains some repeated ideas. A more concise text would facilitate readers’ understanding of the authors’ arguments.

I recommend publication after minor revision. The revision should address the comments outlined above, as well as the additional comments and corrections made directly in the text file and submitted alongside this review.

This is a signed review,

José Birindelli

Author’s Rebuttal Letter (13/01/2026).

We hereby submit a reviewed version of the manuscript now entitled “A new *Corydoras* (Siluriformes: Callichthyidae) from the rio Tefé basin, Brazilian Amazon, with comments on the taxonomic status of *Corydoras orcesi* and a discussion on the mouth morphology in *Corydoradinae*”, NI-2025-0146, by Luiz Fernando Caserta Tencatt, Alexandre Pucci Hercos, Vandergleison de Carvalho, Sérgio A. Santos and Marcelo Britto. Except for minor comments/suggestions by the reviewer related to ‘style issues’, we accepted all of his commentaries. His questions are all addressed below:

Comments:

This is an excellent contribution, as it presents the description of a new species of *Corydoras*, with detailed descriptions and illustrations, and discusses some of the main features in a broader context.

R: Thank you very much.

The text is generally well written, except for the frequent use of the expression “Regarding this...”, which should be avoided and the sentences rewritten in a more direct manner. In addition, expressions used to give emphasis or to amplify statements in an imprecise way should be avoided.

R: Ok, done, we made the changes as suggested by the reviewer.

Abstract. It is not clear to readers who read only the Abstract why the two nominal species (*Corydoras pastazensis* and *C. pastazensis orcesi*) were included in the study. A clearer link should be established between the new species and these two taxa.

R: Ok, done, we added a sentence to clarify this.

Introduction. The Introduction is effective in presenting the rationale for the present

study, except for one detail. Specimens identified in the aquarium literature as CW128 and CW207 are mentioned at the beginning of the Introduction, but the authors do not explicitly state their identity, whether they belong to the new species described here, to *Corydoras pastazensis*, or to another species. This information is provided only in the Results section. However, the authors should include in the Introduction their initial hypotheses regarding these specimens, which are then confirmed (or not) in the Results and Discussion. Or alternatively delete this information from the Introduction.

R: Ok, done. We added a sentence to clarify this.

Material and Methods are detailed and comprehensive.

R: Thank you very much.

Results follow the NI format, with a comparative diagnosis based on color pattern and, as far as I can tell, including all congeners. The description is comprehensive, including well-illustrated osteological features and a detailed account of coloration. The remarks are especially informative regarding the taxonomy of *Corydoras* species other than the new species.

R: Thank you very much.

Discussion is interesting and detailed, and provides new interpretations of morphological characters related to the mouth and barbels that will be helpful for future contributions. However, the section is overly long and contains some repeated ideas. A more concise text would facilitate readers' understanding of the authors' arguments.

Ok, done. We made the changes suggested by the reviewer, including the removal of an entire paragraph. Regarding the size of the discussion, it is still long but much shorter than first version, as we moved many paragraphs to the remarks and reduced the size of some of them. We understand that the size of the paper is long but its content is quite vast, including five axes: (1) a species is described, (2) a species is synonymized, (3) phylogenetic characters available in the literature are re-evaluated/reformulated, (4) a new homology proposal for barbels is proposed, and (5) new characters are proposed and described, it becomes quite complicated to do all this in a small space. We ask you to consider this in your decision.

Comments on the PDF file:

A variação no colorido é realmente um destaque do grupo, mas eu não acho que há muita variação no formato do corpo.

R: The shapes can be considered quite variable when you look to the subfamily as a whole, for instance, compare *G. hastatus*, *A. velites*, *B. britskii*, *H. benattii* and *B. reticulata*.

quantificar, se possível

R: Ok, done.

neste momento fiquei na dúvida sobre a identificação dos exemplares de CW128 e CW207 que vcs mencionaram no começo da introdução. Este exemplares pertencem à espécie nova? Ou à *C. pastazensis*? Ou a nenhuma delas?

R: As explained above, we added a sentence to clarify this.

why not counting all vertebrae? Literature describes the number of first vertebrae fused to the weberian apparatus

R: We count the vertebrae as in all previous studies, so, in order to make the studies comparable, we opted to count this way.

isbrueckeri já é difícil o suficiente. Porque incluir *isaac* no nome da espécie? Fica ianda mais difícil?

R: We agree but there is already a "*Corydoras isbrueckeri*", although not in the genus *Corydoras* anymore, the name is already occupied.

tá meio confuso. Não entendi direito o que vcs quiseram dizer aqui

R: Ok, we reformulated this sentence.

tá meio confuso. Deixar mais claro

R: Ok, we reformulated this sentence.

não entendi a diferença entre os estados 1 e 3.

R: in one the flap expansion is small and in three it is broad (we opted to keep the text as it was originally provided by the author of those characters)

não entendi o uso do "sic" aqui

R: The use is justified by the fact that the original author described his character as "shape" and one of its states is "absent"...

quando um for cônico, o outro vai ser o que?

R: Flat. We understand that the character is a bit confusing but we just wrote as the author described, and this is why we need to review all of these characters.

só tem um de cada lado, correto? Não entendi...

R: In Corydoradinae, yes...but some Callichthyidae may present more (as interpreted by the mentioned author). We disagree with his interpretation, exactly because this character sounds odd.

eu não gosto muito deste tipo de construção. Sugiro vcs reverem isso. Esse tipo de construção aparece bastante ao longo do texto. É equivalente a vc escrever um texto em português e ficar usando "Sobre os caracteres 80 e 193, eles não serão abordados". Fica melhor e mais direto se vc disser: "Os caracteres 80 e 193 não serão abordados".

R: Ok, as aforementioned, we agree and changed the text.

evite o use de expressões como esta. Elas são imprecisas e desnecessárias. Mais atrapalham do que ajudam

R: Ok, agreed, done.

não entendi o por que de usar este palavra tanto

R: The use of variably just means such a feature may be present or not (variably present) in the taxon in question. It is better to use a single work than "in some specimens" several times.

this should be transferred to Funding Information

R: Ok, done.

INCLUDE OPEN SCIENCE ITEMS (see Instruction to Authors)

R: OK, done.

Thank you in advance

Kind regards

The authors

Associate editor's decision after peer review (02/02/2026).

Dear Dr. Tencatt:

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript entitled "A new *Corydoras* (Siluriformes: Callichthyidae) from the rio Tefé basin, Brazilian Amazon, with comments on the taxonomic status of *Corydoras orcesi* and a discussion on the mouth morphology in Corydoradinae" in its current form for publication in the Neotropical Ichthyology.

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. Bruno Melo

Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology
brunfmelo@gmail.com

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

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

- **Tencatt LFC, Hercos AP, Carvalho V, Santos SA, Britto MR.** A new *Corydoras* (Siluriformes: Callichthyidae) from the rio Tefé basin, Brazilian Amazon, with comments on the taxonomic status of *Corydoras orcesi* and a discussion on the mouth morphology in Corydoradinae. Neotrop Ichthyol. 2026; 24(2):e250146. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-0224-2025-0146>



Official Journal of the
Sociedade Brasileira de Ictiologia