

Submission date. 18/02/2026

Associate editor's decision after peer review (26/03/2026).

Dear Mr. Chuctaya:

Manuscript ID NI-2026-0040 entitled "Taxonomic reassessment of *Odontostilbe paraguayensis* and description of a new species of *Odontostilbe* (Characidae: Cheirodontinae) with a small geographic distribution" 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=5e57fb72bc534b788ad3e99b9f55ea22

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 05-Jun-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. Priscila Camelier

Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology

pricamelier@gmail.com

Anonymous reviewer #1

Recommendation. Minor Revision

Comments. Dear Authors, the manuscript is a valuable contribution to the knowledge of *Odontostilbe* and Cheirodontinae in general. The new species is clearly defined and I have no doubts that is a new taxon. I think the monophyly of *Odontostilbe* is still an open question and probably not all the species included now in the genus will remain

there in the future. However, in the present state of knowledge, I'm convinced that the description of the new species in *Odontostilbe* is the best option.

I have only some comments in the manuscript but I think it is almost ready to be accepted and sent to production.

Best regards, Marcos Miranda

Anonymous reviewer #2

Recommendation. Minor Revision

Comments. This is a well written manuscript on the taxonomy of two species of the genus *Odontostilbe* from the Paraguay-Parana river basin. *Odontostilbe paraguayensis* is redescribed and *O. britskii* proposed as a new one. Both descriptions are based on robust evidences taken from a considerable amount of analyzed specimens. I suggest publication after a minor review of several small but important details along the manuscript. All comments are included in the attached document (pdf).

Author's Rebuttal Letter (03/06/2026).

Response to Reviewers

We would like to sincerely thank the Editor and Reviewers for their careful evaluation of our manuscript and for the constructive comments and suggestions provided. Their observations greatly contributed to improving the clarity, consistency, and overall quality of the manuscript.

In the present document, we provide a detailed point-by-point response to each comment raised by the reviewers. All modifications suggested were carefully considered and incorporated into the revised version of the manuscript. Changes made in the manuscript are highlighted in the revised version.

Reviewer 1

Pag2, line14

Comment:

"I don't know if that's a costume in papers on Cheirodontinae, but I think it's not the most usual. However, if clearly stated, as it is, is not a problem."

Response:

We thank the reviewer for this observation. Although this procedure may not represent the most commonly adopted convention in studies on Cheirodontinae, it was explicitly stated in the Materials and Methods section in order to avoid ambiguity and ensure reproducibility. Nevertheless, we slightly revised the wording in the manuscript to improve clarity.

Pag6, line23

Comment:

"With such a clear diagnosis... is it necessary to perform a morphometric analysis?"

Response:

We thank the reviewer for this valuable observation. We agree that the new species is primarily supported by discrete diagnostic characters. The morphometric analysis was included as complementary evidence to evaluate overall shape variation among species and to provide an additional quantitative assessment of morphological differentiation. To simplify the manuscript and avoid redundancy, we removed Figures 13 and 14 and retained only the general PCA summarizing morphometric variation among species.

Pag8, line30

Comment:

Isn't sexually dimorphic? Given that in other species of *Odontostilbe* (as *O. microcephala*) the amount of rosettes is dimorphic, would be good some mention to that feature here, even if it isn't dimorphic in this species.

Response:

We found it sexually dimorphic in both species and corrected the description.

Reviewer 2

Pag5, line28

Comment:

What does it make them more relevant?

Response:

We thank the reviewer for this observation. We agree that the expression was ambiguous. In order to simplify the manuscript and avoid redundancy, Figure 13 and the corresponding text were removed from the revised version.

Pag7, line12

Comment:

Specimens in Fig.1 show ventral profile of caudal peduncle slightly convex.

Response:

We thank the reviewer for this observation. We agree that the ventral profile described in the original text was not clearly discernible in Fig. 1. The description was revised to better reflect the morphology observed in the specimens and illustrated material.

Pag7, line26

Comment:

Last tooth in Fig.2 bearing 1 or 2 cusps?

Response:

We thank the reviewer for this observation. We agree that the cusp number of the posterior dentary teeth is not clearly discernible in Fig. 2. The description was revised to better reflect the observed variation and to avoid overprecision in the cusp counts of the posterior teeth.

Pag8, line25

Comment:

Include number of specimens analyzed.

Response:

The number was included.

Pag9, line3

Comment:

Merge paragraphs in a single one.

Response:

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. The paragraphs in the "Color in alcohol" section were merged into a single paragraph in the revised manuscript.

Pag12, line22

Comment:

Add number of analyzed specimens for each counted trait.

Response:

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. The number of analyzed specimens for the dentition characters was added to the revised manuscript.

Pag12, line27

Comment:

asymmetric in which way? number of lateral cusps? specify.

Response:

We thank the reviewer for this observation. The description of tooth asymmetry was revised to clarify that the asymmetry refers to differences in the size of the lateral cusps on each side of the central cusp.

Pag14, line02

Comment:

based on the analysis of how many specimens?

Response:

The number of analyzed specimens for the gill-raker characters was added to the revised manuscript.

Pag 19, line26

Comment:

This comparison (including Fig.14) seems pointless unless you justify it somewhere in the manuscript.

I can only see a point in keeping it, if you include the remaining species of *Odontostilbe* from the Paraguay-Paraná basin. In that way, the readers can have an idea about the morphological variation of the genus in that basin as well as additional information to identify the species in it.

Response:

We thank the reviewer for this valuable comment. We agree that the comparison presented in Figures 13 and 14 required a broader contextual justification within the genus. Because the species treated in the manuscript are already clearly diagnosable based on discrete morphological characters, we decided to remove Figures 13 and 14 and the corresponding text in order to simplify the manuscript and avoid redundant analyses.

Pag 21, line06

Comment:

Tooth morphology is a traditional character used in Cheirodontinae taxonomy. I don't believe you can classify it as an "additional morphological character" once it has been used prior to Eigenmann (1915).

Response:

We thank the reviewer for this important observation. We agree that tooth morphology represents a traditional taxonomic character widely used in Cheirodontinae systematics since the early literature. The sentence was revised to better distinguish traditional taxonomic characters from other complementary sources of morphological variation discussed in the manuscript.

Pag 21, line28

Comment :

what is the condition found in other congeners? In the diagnosis of *O. paraguayensis* you included *O. britskii* and all the other congeners in the same condition.

Response:

We thank the reviewer for this observation. We agree that the original wording could generate ambiguity regarding the supraneural condition in the remaining congeners. The sentence was revised to clarify that the fused supraneural condition is unique to *Odontostilbe paraguayensis*, whereas all other congeners, including *O. britskii*, possess separate supraneurals.

Pag 23, line22

Comment:

add reference for this citation.

Response:

The citation was added

Pag 23, line22

Comment:

wrong link

Response:

The link was corrected.

Associate editor's decision after peer review (03/07/2026).

Dear Mr. Chuctaya:

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript entitled "Taxonomic reassessment of *Odontostilbe paraguayensis* and description of a new species of *Odontostilbe* (Characidae: Cheirodontinae) with a small geographic distribution" in its current form for publication in the Neotropical Ichthyology. One correction should be made in the

proof: the species names in Figure 12 must be in italics.

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 our Social Media Editor, Igor Souto-Santos, at icass.ufjf@gmail.com within 30 days.

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 send an e-mail to neoichth@nupelia.uem.br 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. Priscila Camelier

Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology

pricamelier@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

- Chuctaya J, Bührnheim C, Malabarba LR. Taxonomic reassessment of *Odontostilbe paraguayensis* and description of a new species of *Odontostilbe* (Characidae: Cheirodontinae) with a small geographic distribution. *Neotrop Ichthyol.* 2026; 24(3):e260040. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-0224-2026-0040>



Official Journal of the
Sociedade Brasileira de Ictiologia