Submission date. 03/12/2025

Associate editor's decision after peer review (30/01/2026).

Dear Ms. Martins:

Manuscript ID NI-2025-0156 entitled "Morphological and molecular analyses evidence reveals two new species of Cambeva (Siluriformes:Trichomycteridae) from the rio Paraná basin, Paraná State, Brazil" which you submitted to the Neotropical Ichthyology, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

One of the reviewer has recommended publication, but also suggest some revisions to your manuscript. The other recommended reject and resubmit considering the scientific merit of the discovery but the profound changes and corrections needed. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript. As editor, I chose accept with major review since it will be an interesting paper and a valuable addition to the knowledge of trichomycterids but as both reviewers highlighted, it needs a major correction from the title to the end.

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=c01ceaf18f6a474c9faa5e3a41a1a21c

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-Apr-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. George Mattox
Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology
gmattox@ib.usp.br, gmattox@ufscar.br

Anonymous reviewer #1
Recommendation. Major Revision
Comments.
O artigo descreve duas espécies de Cambeva para a bacia do rio Paraná. As imagens estão ótimas e o resultado de barcode justifica a descrição das mesmas. No entanto, as principais características morfológicas (i.e., coloração) utilizadas para diagnosticar as novas espécies precisam ser melhor esclarecidas. Figuras com indicações e/ou pranchas comparando os diferentes padrões de coloração ajudaria na compreensão, assim como pranchas incluindo parátipos das novas espécies. Outros caracteres citados na diagnose (número de vértebras) não batem com as descrições, causando um problema grave no entendimento do manuscrito. Entendendo que diagnosticar espécies de um grupo tão diverso e variado no fenótipo seja uma tarefa difícil, sugiro que os autores aprofundem a utilização, análise e/ou discussão dos dados de barcode. Isso poderia ser feito logo no início dos resultados.

Anonymous reviewer #2
Recommendation. Reject & Resubmit
Comments.
O manuscrito intitulado "Morphological and molecular analyses evidence reveals two new species of Cambeva (Siluriformes: Trichomycteridae) from the rio Paraná basin, Paraná State, Brazil" foi cuidadosamente analisado. Comentários detalhados foram inseridos ao longo do arquivo em PDF e, a seguir, são apresentados alguns pontos que merecem atenção especial por parte dos autores. De modo geral, o manuscrito reúne dados morfológicos e moleculares relevantes, com claro potencial para publicação. Entretanto, como amplamente reconhecido por pesquisadores que trabalham com Trichomycteridae, a delimitação específica dentro do grupo é particularmente desafiadora. O crescente número de espécies descritas, aliado à elevada variação intraespecífica, especialmente em padrões de colorido, torna a elaboração de diagnoses claras e inequívocas cada vez mais complexa. Essa observação não deve ser interpretada como desestímulo ao estudo, mas sim como um reforço da necessidade de diagnósticos bem fundamentados e criteriosamente formulados. Nesse contexto, diversos pontos do manuscrito demandam reavaliação ou aprimoramento, com destaque para as diagnoses propostas. Em particular, o padrão de colorido utilizado para caracterizar a primeira espécie não se mostra suficientemente claro, carecendo de uma formulação mais precisa e de uma avaliação comparativa mais abrangente em relação às demais espécies do gênero. Considerando o conjunto das questões levantadas, recomendo que o manuscrito, que apresenta mérito científico e forte potencial para publicação, seja cuidadosamente revisado, com especial atenção aos aspectos diagnósticos, antes de uma nova submissão. Abaixo, alguns pontos a serem observados:
Título: O título da forma como está escrito a seguir "analyses evidence reveals" apresenta redundância. Sugiro o seguinte: Morphological and molecular evidence reveal two News species of Cambeva (Siluriformes: Trichomycteridae) from the rio Parana basin, southern Brazil.
- Retirar em todas as partes do manuscrito.
Abstract: Entendo que a forma de escrita varia de acordo com o estilo de cada autor. No entanto, o abstract/resumo poderia conter informações mais relevantes ao reconhecimento das novas espécies. Diminuir informações genéricas e detalhar melhor pontos chaves do manuscrito, deixando o abstract/resumo mais coeso e completo.
Keywords e Palavras-chave: Colocar em ordem alfabética.
Running head: "Two new Cambeva species from Upper Paraná basin"
- No entanto, uma espécie é descrita para o baixo Paraná. Ajustar.
INTRODUCTION:
Sobre a introdução, ela se apresenta da seguinte forma: descrição detalhada do rio

Paraná; descrição de Trichomycteridae; diagnóstico longo do gênero; lista de espécies conhecidas na região; variação morfológica e uso de COI; objetivo do estudo. A leitura está um pouco descritiva e cansativa ao ler. Sugiro reestruturar de forma que o texto siga o fluxo de contexto mais amplo- problema específico-lacuna de conhecimento e solução proposta. Da forma como o texto se apresenta, a lacuna está diluída. Além disso, a extensa diagnose do gênero Cambeva não é fundamental, sendo que os caracteres não são amplamente fundamentados e utilizados para delimitar morfologicamente o gênero. Caso a discussão tenha como objetivo avaliar esses caracteres, então faria mais sentido um parágrafo descrevendo os caracteres.

Sobre o primeiro parágrafo. Ele é bastante extenso na descrição dos limites das ecorregiões, tornando-se cansativo. Sugiro buscar uma abordagem mais interessante, por exemplo, por que do rio Paraná ser um sistema propício a diversificação de trichomicterídeos. Relacionar mais diretamente a bacia com a diversificação do grupo.

Segundo parágrafo: ele descreve os números absolutos da diversidade de Trichomycteridae, mas não tem nenhuma associação dessa alta diversidade (segunda maior família dentre os Siluriformes, com o gênero Cambeva sendo um dos mas especiosos e de ampla distribuição, por exemplo) com problemas taxonômicos, revisões recentes (ainda há muitas espécies não reconhecidas). O parágrafo está informando, mas não argumentando e nem levando o texto a lacuna de conhecimento e o que foi feito para resolver. Sugiro reformular.

Terceiro parágrafo: Senti falta de enfatizar por que ainda há espécies novas na área. A ideia-chave de diversidade subestimada aparece ao longo do parágrafo, mas não é enfatizada.

Último parágrafo: Conceitualmente está coerente, justificando a dificuldade taxonômica, integrando outras áreas de conhecimento (i.e., ontogenia, distribuição, ecologia...), introduz o uso de dados moleculares adequadamente. No entanto, falta uma conexão para deixar o problema mais explícito. E.g., Despite recent taxonomic efforts....; Species boundaries remain unclear.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Collection data and study area. Informações como comprimento do rio, área da bacia e extensão total são um pouco excessivas para o material e métodos. Essas informações não afetam a coleta, assim como não são usadas em análises e não voltam a ser mencionadas nos resultados. De fora geral há um excesso de informações que não são fundamentais para a replicabilidade da metodologia. Sugestão: Manter o nome das bacias, posição relativa (Upper vs. Lower Parana), eventual gradiente altitudinal, se isso for usado na discussão. Além disso, a estrutura está um pouco desorganizada, dificultando o rápido entendimento ao ler. O parágrafo traz informações de área de estudo, hidrologia detalhada, logística de coleta e questões éticas de coleta. Sugiro separar claramente cada etapa em: 1. Study area and sampling; 2. Permits and ethical procedures; e 3. Specimen processing and preservation.

Molecular data: Deixar claro, no Material e Métodos, por que Trichomycterus nigricans foi escolhido como grupo externo para a análise filogenética. Explicar por que não foi utilizado Scleronema, sendo grupo-irmão de Cambeva, por exemplo.

FIGURE 12: Informar os valores de suporte nos ramos, pelo menos nos principais clados, assim como nos resultados.

Delimitation methods. Seguinte frase: “Three different species delimitation methods were used to validate the results of this study”….

Métodos não “validam” espécies ou resultados. Eles testam hipóteses alternativas de delimitação, especialmente métodos baseados no mesmo locus (COI). No caso, o que foi validado, exatamente? Morfologia? Outro método? Expectativa dos autores? Reescrever a frase, deixando claro por que os seguintes métodos (ASAP, PTP, GMYC...) foram escolhidos. Também sugiro mostrar domínio sobre os métodos, explicando o que cada um faz especificamente.

RESULTS

Figs. 1 e 2: Modificações nas imagens e legendas apontadas diretamente no arquivo de texto;

Fig. 3: barbular bone= ba. Na figura está como “ob”;

Fig. 6: incluir 1-9 branchiostegal rays na legenda da espécie B.

Tabs. 1 e 2: Achei alguns desvios padrões um pouco mais altos do que costumam ser ou variar. Realcei em amarelo para verificação. Coluna de N= 20 pode ser suprimida na tabela e incluída apenas na legenda.

Diagnose 1. A diagnose aparece com estrutura um tanto confusa, necessitando de uma cuidadosa revisão. Os autores separam as espécies novas das suas congêneres primeiramente pelo padrão de colorido; exceto de C. gamaberladense e C. pantera, no entanto, o padrão de colorido apresentado pelas espécies são muito semelhantes a outras espécies do gênero não citadas, por exemplo, C. davisi. Também não fica claro o padrão descrito pelos autores.

Ponto 1. Apesar de trabalhoso, sugiro fazer um quadro comparativo com os padrões de colorido dentro do gênero, de forma a deixar claro o padrão descrito para as espécies e que são suficientemente distintas das demais.

Ponto 2. Cambeva pantera e C. gamaberladense aparecem repetidamente em blocos separados. Não há necessidade, quando já é citada uma vez na separação de caracteres. Reestruturar.

Ponto 3. Não fica claro por que cita Cambeva davisi, seguida de C. gamaberladense (novamente) e C. perobana. Imagino que sejam as espécies proximamente relacionadas na filogenia. Então tem que ficar claro tal detalhamento. Lembrando que as duas últimas já foram citadas de forma repetitiva.

Sugiro uma reestruturação geral e com maior coesão da diagnose como um todo.

Description: Informar o número de diafanizados em material e métodos e ao longo da descrição (C&S).

Conservation status pag. 14: O parágrafo apresenta AOO de 60,000 km2 como menor que 500 km2 utilizando o critério B2. No entanto, há uma inconsistência nos valores, não? Favor revisar. Caso não haja ameaça, não é necessário calcular EOO e AOO. Se houver, rever valores. Reescrever.

- Uso de morphotypes: Sugiro trocar o termo morphotypes por new species dentro de cada contexto, visto que vocês estão descrevendo os morfotipos como espécies novas.

- Revisar e padronizar o uso de Upper Parana basin/Upper rio Parana; Lower Parana basin/lower rio Parana.

Molecular data. Necessita de melhor descrição sobre as relações filogenéticas da árvore, incluindo os valores de suporte dos ramos. Colocar também na imagem apresentada.

No seguinte parágrafo: “The molecular delimiters indicated overall congruence in recognizing C. marginimaculata and C. marliae as distinct species (Fig. 12B). The ASAP, PTP, and mGMYC methods support the hypothesis that both represent evolutionarily independent lineages. However, the sGMYC method suggested that the two morphotypes and C. perobana represent the same species.”

Esse parágrafo está bem confuso. Vocês falam que s duas espécies são legítimas. Certo, é isso que consigo ver na análise com as delimitações.

Mas logo abaixo, vocês falam o seguinte: “The ASAP, PTP, and mGMYC methods support the hypothesis that both represent evolutionarily independent lineages. However, the sGMYC method suggested that the two morphotypes and C. perobana represent the same species.”

Mas olhando a representação da delimitação de vocês, não consta que C. perobana está sendo delimitada juntamente com as duas espécies novas em questão.

Na verdade os três métodos de delimitação estão congruentes, em que as duas espécies são reconhecidas como linhagens diferentes (segundos os métodos testados). Em nenhuma das delimitações (segundo a imagem) aparece junto com C. perobana.

Em síntese, o estudo apresenta contribuição relevante para o conhecimento da diversidade das Cambeva, e, após a incorporação das revisões sugeridas, tem plenas condições de ser considerado para publicação.

Author's Rebuttal Letter (10/03/2026).
Dear Editor,
We are re-submitting the reviewed version of our manuscript NI-2025-0156. We appreciate your efforts to improve our manuscript. We have accepted the suggestions and tried to be as specific as possible in our responses, which are detailed below.
If you need any more information, we are available for any clarification.
Sincerely,
IC Martins and Co-authors.
Reviewer #1
#1 Abstract: Are you referring to the species described in the article or in general?
R: We thank the reviewer for this comment. We redid the entire summary.
#2 Abstract: It is better to use species or new species.
R: Thank you, we agree and changed the text.
#3 Introduction: In the Paraná state?
R: Thank you for pointing this out. The text has been revised to clarify the geographic scope of the lower rio Paraná ecoregion, according to Abell et al. (2008). The reference to the rio Paraguay has been removed to avoid geographic inaccuracies regarding the state of Paraná.
#4 Introduction: Rio Plate? Is that right?
R: We thank the reviewer for noticing this. "rio Plate" was corrected to "río de la Plata basin" in accordance with the standard geographic terminology.
#5 Introduction: Confused
R: Thank you, we agree and changed the text.
#6 Introduction: Which basins?
R: Thank you, we added the reference to the upper and lower rio Paraná basins.
#7 Introduction: Why is this necessary? To define the morphotypes? To understand their ecology? It wasn't clear.
R: Thank you. We changed the text to explicitly state that these factors are important for species delimitation, thereby improving clarity.
#8 Introduction: It's the opposite, right?
R: We thank the reviewer for this observation. Yes, the order of the elements in the sentence was reversed.
#9 Material and methods: It took me a while to understand the sampling region... it would be better to cite the map here and indicate all these rivers, not just the Piquiri basin... There should be more comments throughout the text with my questions about the occurrence of the described species.
R: We thank you for your suggestion, but we respectfully disagree. We believe it would be better to divide the sampled region into ecoregions (lower and upper rio Paraná basins), as indicating the name of each river would make the image dense with elements. To illustrate the sampling location, we cite the figure in this section of Material and Methods.
#10 Material and methods: To cite the work of the description of Cambeva damnata.
R: Thank you, we agree and add to the text.
#11 Material and methods: Which species? Cite or refer to a table.
R: Thank you, we have added to the text a citation of Supplementary Table 1 with the names of the species and their respective sequences.
#12 Material and methods: I'm not sure if "Distribution Data" would be the most appropriate title for the topic.
R: Thank you, we changed the topic to "Geographic distribution analyses".

PEER REVIEW FILE

#13 Results (Paratypes - C. marginimaculata): I was thinking that the species only occurred in the Piquiri basin... adjust introduction.
R: We thank the reviewer for this comment. We changed the text to make the species'location clearer.
#14 Results (Diagnosis - C. marginimaculata): Considering that many other Cambeva species have rounded spots (with many variations), it seems to me that this (brown margins) would be a big difference, right? This needs to be illustrated or planned to make it clear. A plate with some species showing the presence/absence of these margins would greatly help in understanding this characteristic.
R: Thank you for the suggestion. We made a plate highlighting the character in our paratypes.
#15 Results (Diagnosis - C. marginimaculata): Isn't that number quite low for Cambeva? This characteristic may be more useful in the diagnosis.
R: Thank you for the suggestion. It is a low number of vertebrae in extraneous counts, but there is overlap in counts with other species, so we do not use it as a single characteristic to distinguish it from all other species.
#16 Results (Diagnosis - C. marginimaculata): Additionally?
R: Thank you for the suggestion. We changed the diagnosis to be clearer in the text.
#17 Results (Osteology - C. marginimaculata): The numbers don't match the diagnosis... the same for the other species.
R: Thank you. Sorry for the mistake. Some additional measures were made before submission, and we forgot to add in the text. We revised and made all the changes.
#18 Results (Etymology - C. marginimaculata): The epithet?
R: Yes, we changed the text to "The specific name of Cambeva marginimaculata highlights [...]".
#19 Results (Conservation status - C. marginimaculata): Actually, no... it only suggests that the species has a restricted distribution.
R: Thank you, we agree and adjusted the text.
#20 Results (Conservation status - C. marginimaculata): Based on what was said in the ecological notes and below, wouldn't it be possible to indicate the sub-criterion of decline in habitat quality? And the disappearance in areas caused by siltation is worrying... Clarify which pieces of information would be isolated, because the text leads one to believe that the species is not so comfortable…
R: We thank the reviewer for this comment. By "isolated observations", we refer to localized instances of habitat alteration that have not yet been shown to represent a continuous or widespread decline affecting all known populations. We revised the text to clarify and better explain that, although local impacts are a cause for concern, the currently available data are insufficient to formally infer a continued decline according to IUCN standards. We also emphasized that future monitoring is recommended, given the species' restricted distribution and localized habitat modification.
#21 Results (Diagnosis - C. marliae): I don't see any dark spots on the side of the holotype's body.
R: The specimens have rounded spots that join together to form the discontinuous stripe. Therefore, we maintained the described color pattern, taking into account the suggestion made regarding the figure with the paratypes.
#22 Results (Diagnosis - C. marliae): Discontinuous in the anterior region and caudal peduncle? Photos of paratypes could help to understand this characteristic... Comparative plates…
R: Thank you for the suggestion. We added in the text.
#23 Results (Diagnosis - C. marliae): Wouldn't this low number be useful for distinguishing it from the vast majority of Cambeva?
R: Some species have a low number of vertebrae; the problem is that there are variations that end up overlapping the extremes of different species. Thank you very much for the

suggestion.
#24 Results (Conservation status - C. marliae): DD is justified when we don't understand how threats to a species are acting... not only because we don't know its "real" distribution. In other words, it needs to be clear what the possible threats to the species are (ecological notes can help).
R: Thank you for this comment. We agree and revised the text, explaining the potential threats suggested by the ecological context of the known localities, including habitat alteration associated with agricultural activities and possible ecological pressures from non-native species.
#25 Results (Molecular data): Here are the results for both species... adjust the location in the manuscript... same for the topic below.
R: We thank the reviewer for the suggestion. However, we keep the molecular results and geographic distribution after the species descriptions because they provide complementary evidence for species delimitation and directly link each taxon to its genetic identity and geographic range. We followed the format adopted in recent species description papers published in Neotropical Ichthyology using morphological and molecular data.
Reviewer #2
#1 Title: The title, as it is written below, “analyses evidence reveals,” is redundant. I suggest the following: Morphological and molecular evidence reveal two new species of Cambeva (Siluriformes: Trichomycteridae) from the Rio Paraná basin, southern Brazil.
R: Thank you, we agree and changed the text.
#2 Keywords: Put in alphabetical order.
R: Thank you, we agree and changed the order.
#3 Running head: “Two new species of Cambeva from the Upper Paraná basin” - However, one species is described for the lower Paraná. Adjust.
R: Thank you, we agree and changed the text.
#4 Introduction: Update to 471.
R: Thank you, we agree and changed the text.
#5 Introduction: Update to 341.
R: Thank you, we agree and changed the text.
#6 Introduction: Regarding the introduction, it is presented as follows: detailed description of the Paraná River; description of Trichomycteridae; lengthy diagnosis of the genus; list of known species in the region; morphological variation and use of COI; objective of the study. The reading is somewhat descriptive and tiring. I suggest restructuring it so that the text follows the flow of broader context - specific problem - knowledge gap, and proposed solution. As the text is presented, the gap is diluted.
R: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. The Introduction has been restructured to improve flow and better highlight the knowledge gap and the study's objective.
#7 Introduction: An extensive diagnosis of the genus Cambeva is not essential, since the characters are not widely established and used to morphologically define the genus. If the discussion aims to evaluate these characters, then a paragraph describing them would make more sense.
R: We thank the reviewer for this observation. We agree and removed this part from the introduction.
#8 Introduction: Regarding the first paragraph: It is quite lengthy in its description of the ecoregion boundaries, becoming tiresome. I suggest seeking a more engaging approach, for example, explaining why the Paraná River is a system conducive to the diversification of trichomycterids. Relate the river basin more directly to the diversification of the group.
R: Thank you, we agree and changed the text.
#9 Introduction: Second paragraph: it describes the absolute numbers of Trichomycteridae diversity, but it doesn't associate this high diversity (the second largest family among

Siluriformes, with the genus Cambeva being one of the most speciose and widely distributed, for example) with taxonomic problems or recent revisions (there are still many unrecognized species). The paragraph is informative, but does not argue or address the knowledge gap and what has been done to resolve it. I suggest reformulating it.
R: Thank you, we agree and changed the text.
#10 Introduction: Third paragraph: I felt the paragraph lacked emphasis on why there are still new species in the area. The key idea of underestimated diversity appears throughout the paragraph, but it is not emphasized.
R: Thank you, we agree and changed the text.
#11 Introduction: Last paragraph: Conceptually, it is coherent, justifying the taxonomic difficulty, integrating other areas of knowledge (i.e., ontogeny, distribution, ecology...), and introducing the use of advanced molecular data. However, it lacks a connection to make the problem more explicit. For example, despite recent taxonomic efforts… The species boundaries remain obscure.
R: Thank you, we agree and changed the text.
#12 Introduction: "with emphasis on the sequences of the mitochondrial COI gene". This phrase is redundant, as you are only using the COI gene. As it is written, it seems you are emphasizing the COI gene among other genes. Rephrase or remove this phrase for better comprehension and greater textual cohesion.
R: Thank you, we agree and removed the phrase.
#13 Material and methods (Collection data and study area): Information such as river length, basin area, and total extent is somewhat excessive for the materials and methods. This information does not affect collection, is not used in analyses, and is not mentioned again in the results. Overall, there is an excess of information that is not fundamental to the replicability of the methodology. Suggestion: Keep the basin names, relative position (Upper vs. Lower Paraná), and any altitudinal gradient, if used in the discussion. Furthermore, the structure is somewhat disorganized, making it difficult to quickly understand while reading. The paragraph provides information on the study area, detailed hydrology, collection logistics, and ethical issues related to collection. I suggest clearly separating each step into: 1. Study area and sampling; 2. Permits and ethical procedures; and 3. Specimen processing and preservation.
R: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. The section was reorganized and reduced to focus on information relevant to sampling and methodological replicability.
#14 Material and methods (Morphological data): Give examples of which morphological characteristics you used to compare the species: for example, color pattern, morphometry, number of fin rays, osteology…
R: We thank the reviewer for the suggestion. We revised the Materials and methods section to indicate which morphological characteristics were used in the comparisons.
#15 Material and methods (Molecular data): In the Materials and Methods section, clearly state why Trichomycterus nigricans was chosen as the outgroup for phylogenetic analysis. Explain why Scleronema, for example, being a sister group to Cambeva, was not used.
R: We thank the reviewer for this comment. We clarified in the materials and methods section that Trichomycterus nigricans was selected as the outgroup because, among the available sequences, it presented the highest base-pair overlap with our COI dataset.
#16 Material and methods (Molecular data): BEAUTi would be an interface for BEAST, right?
R: Thank you for this observation. We agree and removed the interface BEAUTi of the text.
#17 Material and methods (Delimitation methods): "Three different species delimitation methods were used to validate the results of this study". Methods do not "validate" species or results. They test alternative delimitation hypotheses, especially same-locus-of-indigestion (SLOI) methods. In this case, what exactly was validated? Morphology?

Another method? The authors' expectations? Rewrite the sentence, making it clear why the following methods (ASAP, PTP, GMYC...) were chosen. I also suggest demonstrating mastery of the methods, explaining what each one specifically does.
R: Thank you for the suggestion. We changed the text to be clearer: Our goal is to corroborate or not the delimitation made by morphological analysis. We also added explanations about the methods utilized.
#17 Material and methods (Delimitation methods): The link (https://bioinfo.mnhn.fr/abi/public/asap/) does not open.
R: Thank you for pointing that out, but we believe it's a problem with the website itself, as the link is also unavailable in the method's description article (https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.13281).
#18 Material and methods (Delimitation methods): Trichomycterus would be the outgroup. Scleronema is the sister group to Cambeva, according to the phylogeny so far.
R: We thank the reviewer for this comment. We agree and changed the text.
#19 Material and methods (Distribution data): Please specify the page where the shapes are available, if possible.
R: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. The specific web pages from which the shapefiles were obtained were added to the material and methods section.
#20 Material and methods (Distribution data): If the species is categorized as LC (not threatened), then it is not necessary to present EOO and AOO calculations.
R: We respectfully disagree with the assertion that calculating EOO and AOO is unnecessary for species classified as LC. We use these IUCN metrics to ensure a transparent and standardized assessment according to criterion B. Although the values indicate a restricted distribution for Cambeva marginimaculata, for example, the species does not meet the additional sub-criteria required for a threat category. Therefore, the inclusion of EOO and AOO justifies the use of other subcriteria for the species assessment.
#21 Results (C. marginimaculata): Replace "riacho de nome desconhecido" with "unnamed stream".
R: Thank you, we agree and changed the text.
#22 Results (C. marginimaculata): Repeated information: “Epibranchial 4 rectangular”.
R: Thank you, we removed it from the text.
#23 Results (Diagnosis - C. marginimaculata): The diagnosis appears somewhat confusingly structured, requiring careful review. The authors separate the new species from their congeners primarily by color pattern; however, except for C. gamaberladense and C. pantera, the color pattern presented by the species is very similar to other unmentioned species of the genus, for example, C. davisi. The pattern described by the authors is also unclear.
Point 1. Although it is laborious, I suggest creating a comparative chart of color patterns within the genus, in order to clearly show the pattern described for the species and that they are sufficiently distinct from the others.
Point 2. Cambeva pantera and C. gamaberladense appear repeatedly in separate blocks. This is unnecessary, as it is already mentioned once in the character separation. Restructure.
Point 3. It's unclear why Cambeva davisi is mentioned, followed by C. gamaberladense (again) and C. perobana. I imagine these are closely related species in the phylogeny. Therefore, this level of detail needs to be clear. It's worth remembering that the last two have already been mentioned repeatedly.
R: Thank you for all the suggestions. We restructured the diagnosis to fit all suggestions and to improve understanding.
#24 Descriptions (C. marginimaculata and C. marliae): Report the number of cleared items in materials and methods and throughout the description (C&S).

R: Thank you for this suggestion. We added the number of cleared and stained (c&s) specimens in the material and methods section: “Osteological information analyses were carried out using the clearing and staining method of Taylor, Van Dyke (1985) on seven specimens, five of C. marginimaculata sp. nov. and C. marliae sp. nov.”. We also clarified that all osteological counts and observations refer exclusively to c&s specimens: “All osteological counts and observations refer exclusively to cleared and stained (c&s) specimens”. To avoid excessive repetition and improve readability, the abbreviation c&s was not inserted after each count throughout the description.
#25 Use of morphotypes: I suggest replacing the term "morphotypes" with "new species" within each context, since you are describing the morphotypes as new species.
R: Thank you, we agree and replaced the terms in the text.
#26 Review and standardize: Upper Parana basin/Upper Rio Parana; Lower Parana basin/Lower Rio Parana.
R: Thank you, we standardized it as "upper rio Paraná/upper rio Paraná basin" and "lower rio Paraná/lower rio Paraná basin".
#27 Results (Molecular data): A better description of the tree's phylogenetic relationships is needed, including branch support values. This should also be included in the image provided.
Figure 12 - Report the support values in the branches, at least in the main clades, as well as in the results.
R: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We changed the text and added the branch support values in the figure.
#28 Results (Molecular data): “The molecular delimiters indicated overall congruence in recognizing C. marginimaculata and C. marliae as distinct species (Fig. 12B). The ASAP, PTP, and mGMYC methods support the hypothesis that both represent evolutionarily independent lineages. However, the sGMYC method suggested that the two morphotypes and C. perobana represent the same species.” This paragraph is quite confusing. You say that both species are legitimate. Right, that's what I can see in the analysis with the delimitations. But right below, you say the following: “The ASAP, PTP, and mGMYC methods support the hypothesis that both represent evolutionarily independent lineages. However, the sGMYC method suggested that the two morphotypes and C. perobana represent the same species.” However, looking at your delimitation representation, it does not show that C. perobana is being delimited together with the two new species in question. In fact, the three delimitation methods are congruent in that the two species are recognized as different lineages (according to the methods tested). In none of the delimitations (according to the image) does it appear together with C. perobana.
R: Thank you very much for the highlight; it was actually a mistake we made, and a method was missing in the final figure. We added the method and revised the entire text. This method grouped other species, but here and in the discussion, we argue that these cases can happen and that they do not invalidate the description of a new species.
#29 Figs. 1 and 2: Modifications to the images and captions are indicated directly in the text file.
R: Thank you, we made the required changes. We standardized all the letters A, B, C, and D to a font size of 14.
#30 Fig. 3: Barbular bone = ba. In the figure, it is shown as “ob”.
R: Thank you, we replaced it in the figure.
#31 Fig. 6: Include 1-9 branchiostegal rays in the caption for species B.
R: We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. We added the number of branchiostegal rays for B to the text.
#32 Tabs. 1 and 2: I found some standard deviations to be slightly higher than usual or to vary. I highlighted them in yellow for verification. The column with N=20 can be omitted from the table and included only in the caption.

R: We thank the reviewer for your evaluation of the tables. Morphometric data were measured twice for each specimen because the standard deviation was high, but the calculations were confirmed. The relatively larger standard deviations likely reflect observed intraspecific variation. In addition, the column indicating sample size was removed from the table, and this information was included in the caption, as suggested.

Associate editor's decision after peer review (24/06/2026).
Dear Ms. Martins:
Manuscript ID NI-2025-0156.R1 entitled "Morphological and molecular evidence reveals two new species of Cambeva (Siluriformes: Trichomycteridae) from the rio Paraná basin, Paraná State, Brazil" 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=89bedc64802545f98697501d80f8a9a5
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 24-Aug-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. George Mattox
Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology
gmattox@ib.usp.br, gmattox@ufscar.br
Entire Scoresheet:
Reviewer: 1
Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:
The article is practically ready for publication, but I really could not observe the short filament in the first pectoral fin of C. marilae. In addition, I wanted to understand about the morphotypes of Pereira et al., 2024 cited in the discussion: "it is possible
that some of these morphotypes correspond to the species described in the present study". Did the authors examine theses morphotypes in hands? No? Why not? I believe that authors can provide a better conclusion about all "morphotypes" present in the studied basins. Lastly, the recent paper of Costa 2026 (below) changed some Trichomycterinae classification and probably demand a minor review in some species or species groups cited in the manuscript.
Comparative morphology and generic classification of catfishes of the Trichomycterus lineage (Siluriformes: Trichomycteridae). Taxonomy v. 6 (no. 1): 1-34.
Reviewer: 2
Recommendation: Major Revision
Comments:
I believe the manuscript provides valuable insights into the diversity of Cambeva in the Paraná River basin. The description of two new species is potentially well supported by the available evidence. However, I identified several issues related to molecular analyses, species delimitation procedures, the presentation of results, and the organization of the discussion that should be addressed before publication. My specific comments and suggestions are provided throughout the annotated manuscript.
Reviewer: 3
Recommendation: Minor Revision
Comments:
Standardize the descriptions of the two species. They should be written in telegraphic style, omitting verbs, articles, and prepositions. In the *Cambeva marginimaculata* description section, the article "the" is used throughout the text, whereas in the *Cambeva marlie* section, it is omitted in only part of the text. Remove the articles from both texts and make the necessary adjustments.
In the measurement tables for both species, decimal values must be separated by a period rather than a comma.
Page 22, lines 46 and 47: remove "As noted by the authors".
Add a diagnosis distinguishing between *Cambeva marginimaculata* and *Cambeva marlie*. Although the initial diagnostic statements attempt to distinguish each species from its congeners generally (stating "*Cambeva marliae* differs from all congeners" and "*Cambeva marginimaculata* differs from all congeners"), the existence of a certain resemblance between the two, combined with their sympatry, necessitates a more specific distinction between them. Please examine the number of opercular odontodes in greater detail; the text and illustration suggest a potential diagnostic difference.
If yes, please provide details below: Standardize the descriptions of the two species. They should be written in telegraphic style, omitting verbs, articles, and prepositions. In the *Cambeva marginimaculata* description section, the article "the" is used throughout the text, whereas in the *Cambeva marlie* section, it is omitted in only part of the text. Remove the articles from both texts and make the necessary adjustments.
In the measurement tables for both species, decimal values must be separated by a period rather than a comma.
Page 22, lines 46 and 47: remove "As noted by the authors".
Add a diagnosis distinguishing between *Cambeva marginimaculata* and *Cambeva marlie*. Although the initial diagnostic statements attempt to distinguish each species from its congeners generally (stating "*Cambeva marliae* differs from all congeners" and "*Cambeva marginimaculata* differs from all congeners"), the existence of a certain resemblance between the two, combined with their sympatry, necessitates a more specific distinction between them. Please examine the number of opercular odontodes

in greater detail; the text and illustration suggest a potential diagnostic difference.

Author's Rebuttal Letter (22/08/2026).
Dear Editor,
We are re-submitting the reviewed version of our manuscript NI-2025-0156. We appreciate your efforts to improve our manuscript. We have accepted the suggestions and tried to be as specific as possible in our responses, which are detailed below.
If you need any more information, we are available for any clarification.
Sincerely,
IC Martins and Co-authors.
Reviewer #1
#1 The article is practically ready for publication, but I really could not observe the short filament in the first pectoral fin of C. marliae.
R: Thank you very much for the observation. We have included a figure (Fig. 11) showing the filament on the pectoral fin of some C. marliae specimens.
#2 In addition, I wanted to understand about the morphotypes of Pereira et al., 2024 cited in the discussion: "it is possible that some of these morphotypes correspond to the species described in the present study". Did the authors examine theses morphotypes in hands? No? Why not? I believe that authors can provide a better conclusion about all "morphotypes" present in the studied basins.
R: We thank the reviewer for this observation. The specimens examined by Pereira et al. (2021) were not available for direct examination during the preparation of the present study. We recognize this as a limitation and have revised the text to make this explicit, framing the comparison as tentative and identifying the re-examination of those morphotypes as a priority for future work.
#3 Lastly, the recent paper of Costa 2026 (below) changed some Trichomycterinae classification and probably demand a minor review in some species or species groups cited in the manuscript. Comparative morphology and generic classification of catfishes of the Trichomycterus lineage (Siluriformes: Trichomycteridae). Taxonomy v. 6 (no. 1): 1-34.
R: Thank you, we agree and have updated the text.
Reviewer #2
#1 475, please update this reference accordingly.
R: Thank you, we agree and have updated the text.
#2 Update all to 2026.
R: Thank you, we agree and have updated the text.

#3 Incomplete sentence!
R: Thank you, we changed the text.
#4 Add references.
R: Thank you, we included the reference in the text.
#5 Where were recently collected specimens deposited?
R: Thank you, we agree and have updated the text.
#6 Not listed in References.
R: Thank you. It was listed as 2024 in the references, but the work is from 2025. We have updated it.
#7 In which program did you perform the search for the best fit evolutionary model? This needs to be explicitly stated on M&M.
R: Thank you. Both the substitution model and the ML tree were generated using MEGA 11. We have updated the text to make this information more explicit.
#8 If you generated this tree for systematic/topological analyses, it's fine. However, if you used this tree in your coalescent species delimitation analyses, the selected prior may not be adequate. BEAST offers tree priors specifically for coalescent analyses, and

these should be used accordingly. A BD model is more appropriate for a phylogenetic analyses focused on species diversification, not in population-level coalescent processes. Coalescent species delimitation methods rely on branch length distributions to distinguish between interspecific diversification and intraspecific coalescent processes. A BD prior assumes diversification through speciation and extinction (exclusively) across all lineages and may therefore bias estimates of node ages and branch lengths relative to a coalescent prior. This could artificially increase or decrease the apparent transition between species-level and population-level processes, potentially leading to over- or under-splitting of lineages during species delimitation. Maybe this adjustment wil impact your delimitation results for sGMYC.
R: Thank you. We agreed and conducted a new analysis using the coalescent model. Based on the new Bayesian tree, we performed a new analysis using the GMYC delimiter and obtained results consistent with the previous analysis regarding the two new species.
#9 As it is written, it may give the reader the feeling you performed molecular-based species delimitation methods solely to corroborate your morphological findings, and not as a complementary tool to provide a more robust framework for you species' hypothesis.
R: The sentence was revised to reflect the iterative nature of the approach, presenting both lines of evidence as complementary components.
#10 If the dataset was reduced to unique haplotypes for GMYC, you should apply the same criterion consistently to the other species delimitation analyses, particularly PTP, or explicitly justifying why different datasets were used.
R: The use of different datasets among methods was explicitly justified in the revised text. GMYC requires an ultrametric tree as input, which precludes the inclusion of sequences with zero-length branches arising from identical haplotypes; therefore, the analysis was performed using only unique haplotypes. ASAP and PTP do not impose this restriction and were applied to the complete dataset of 163 sequences. This distinction is now clearly stated in the Methods section.
#11 The authors state that the GMYC analysis was performed using a Bayesian tree built from single haplotypes. However, it is unclear whether the Bayesian phylogeny described above (line ~58) was also inferred using only unique haplotypes or whether a separate tree was generated specifically for the GMYC analysis. Please clarify the dataset used to infer the ultrametric tree employed in the GMYC analyses.
R: The text was revised to clarify that the ultrametric tree used in the GMYC analysis is the same Bayesian tree described in the phylogenetic analyses section, which was inferred from single haplotypes. No separate tree was generated for this analysis.
#12 Figs. 1 and 2?
R: Thank you, we changed the text.
#13 How many in C. panthera?
R: The number of vertebrae in C. panthera (37) was not cited in the counter-argument because it overlaps with the number of vertebrae in C. marginimaculata (34–37).
#14 How many dentary teeth arranged in how many rows (if applicable)?
R: Thank you, we have included that information in the text.
#15 The presentation of the molecular results is very superificial. The phylogenetic analyses contains relevant topological information, and nothing is mentioned here, not even about potential differences between ML and IB analyses. You must expand this section to explicitly describe the major clades recovered, support values, sister-group relationships, and any noteworthy patterns observed in the dataset, rather than relying almost exclusively on the figures.
R: Thank you very much for the suggestion. We have added relevant information, such as support values, as well as the inconsistencies found across the different methods. Regarding the topology, given that the study focuses on the description of two new

species, we chose not to discuss this aspect in depth.
#16 Figure 12A does not depict the ML tree topology. You must indicate whether the results obtained by the IB and ML analyses are indentical (or not) in the respective figure caption.
R: Thank you so much for the suggestion. Since the ML tree was used mainly to check for potential topology differences and to run the PTP and bPTP analyses, we've added it to the Supplementary Material and briefly discussed the genetic position of our species relative to its sister group. As noted, the topology is identical in both analyses.
#17 This section would benefit from a clearer and more logical structure. Currently, molecular and morphological evidence are discussed in a fragmented manner, with the text repeatedly shifting between genetic and morphological arguments. You should reorganize this section so that all lines of evidence supporting species recognition are discussed in a more integrated way.
R: Thank you, the Discussion section was reorganized to present the lines of evidence in a more integrated and logical sequence.
#18 Which threshold? Based on what? Genetic distance data must be carefully approached considering the results of other methods, given that overall similarity does not necessarily reflects a common evolutionary history. These assumptions should be stated with more caution.
R: We appreciate the comment and agree. The sentence "The genetic divergence observed between the two new species and their congeners lies at the threshold" has been removed because it was imprecise. The revised paragraph now explicitly identifies the 2% threshold based on the COI gene and clarifies that species delimitation in this study is based on multiple lines of evidence rather than solely on distance values.
#19 It is very important to notice the complete absence of Cambeva davisi on this list, the only two other species known to occur in the rio Piquiri basin. Nothing is stated on M&M about how comparisons were made between these two new species and davisi. Moreover, the authors highlight the high intraspecific variability of morphological characters in C. davisi, what stresses out the need of including a wide sampling of this species here in this section.
R: We thank you. We agree and have included the C. davisi specimens we analyzed in the comparative material. Additionally, we added M&M references of our paper that analyzed C. davisi vouchers: "Comparisons were made with examined specimens of congeneric species (see comparative material), comparative material analyzed by dos Reis et al. (2023) and dos Reis et al. (2025b)"
Reviewer #3
#1 Standardize the descriptions of the two species. They should be written in telegraphic style, omitting verbs, articles, and prepositions. In the Cambeva marginimaculata description section, the article "the" is used throughout the text, whereas in the Cambeva marliae section, it is omitted in only part of the text. Remove the articles from both texts and make the necessary adjustments.
R: Thank you, we agree and removed the prepositions, articles, and verbs.
#2 In the measurement tables for both species, decimal values must be separated by a period rather than a comma.
R: Thank you, we agree and changed the decimal values.
#3 Page 22, lines 46 and 47: remove "As noted by the authors".
R: Thank you, the sentence was removed from the text.
#4 Add a diagnosis distinguishing between Cambeva marginimaculata and Cambeva marlie. Although the initial diagnostic statements attempt to distinguish each species from its congeners generally (stating "Cambeva marliae differs from all congeners" and "Cambeva marginimaculata differs from all congeners"), the existence of a certain resemblance between the two, combined with their sympatry, necessitates a more specific distinction between them. Please examine the number of opercular odontodes

in greater detail; the text and illustration suggest a potential diagnostic difference.
R: An explicit diagnosis distinguishing C. marginimaculata from C. marliae was included in the descriptions of both species. In addition to the color pattern, two characters were added: the premaxillary teeth count (32–36 vs. 44–46) and the condition of the epiphyseal bar (entirely ossified vs. inconspicuous and incomplete). Regarding opercular odontodes, given that the counts for the two species are similar (10–11 vs. 12) and the number of cleared-and-stained specimens of C. marliae is smaller, it was decided not to include this character.

Associate editor's decision after peer review (29/08/2026).
Dear Ms. Martins:
Manuscript ID NI-2025-0156.R2 entitled "Morphological and molecular evidence reveals two new species of Cambeva (Siluriformes: Trichomycteridae) from the rio Paraná basin, Paraná State, Brazil" which you submitted to the Neotropical Ichthyology, has been reviewed only by me.
Attached is a PDF with some minor editorial suggestions. Therefore, I invite you to respond to my 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=b44549f1749444dcb9dce6e15b662e8a
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 29-Sep-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. George Mattox
Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology
gmattox@ib.usp.br, gmattox@ufscar.br

Author's Rebuttal Letter (08/09/2026).
Dear Editor,
We are resubmitting the revised version of our manuscript NI-2025-0156. We appreciate your efforts to improve our manuscript. We have addressed and accepted all the suggestions provided. Any comments or suggestions that were not incorporated have been clearly indicated and justified in our response to the reviewers/editor.
If you need any more information, we are available for any clarification.
Sincerely,
IC Martins and Co-authors.
1- Missing one R here
Resposta: Obrigado pela observação, porém, nesse caso, o nome completo do Weferson é sem o "R", sendo parte do seu sobrenome "Júnio da Graça".
2- Basibranquial é o nome do osso então ele não pode ser inteiramente cartilaginoso. alterar ligeiramente a redação para refletir esse fato.
Resposta: Obrigado pela sugestão. Em Trichomycterinae o basibranquial 4 não sofre ossificação, continuando completamente cartilaginoso. Utilizamos a forma de escrita e a nomenclatura citada no M&M.
3- Não entendi por que apenas dá o número das vértebras pós-Weberianas, se no material e métodos disse que as vértebras do aparelho de Weber foram contadas separadamente. Aqui e na parte da origem das nadadeiras dorsal e anal deveria levar em conta as quatro vértebras do aparelho de Weber.
Resposta: Obrigado pela sugestão. No Material e métodos é mencionada a seguinte frase: "Vertebral counts exclude the vertebrae of the Weberian complex". Utilizamos essa forma, para padronizar a comparação entre outras espécies dos grupos próximos.
4- A NI pede que em descrições originais de espécies, material não tipo seja justificado por não ser considerado da série tipo.
Resposta: Obrigado pela explicação e sugestão. Adicionamos no material e métodos o motivo de serem considerados não tipo: "Non-type specimens are poorly preserved specimens".
5- Anguloarticular não aparece apontado na figura, embora apareça na lista de abreviações. Possivelmente os mcs posteriores foram apontados equivocadamente na figura.
Resposta: Obrigada pela observação, nós fizemos as alterações necessárias.
6- Não havia outro exemplar para ser designado holótipo ? este está muito torto…
Resposta: Muito obrigado pela sugestão. Consideramos esse holótipo por possuir os caracteres diagnósticos bem conspícuos e definidos, além de ser um dos maiores indíviduos coletados. Apesar de estar torto, tiramos a foto do indivíduo em um aquário em V, que possibilitou deixar o espécime reto. Além disso, tomamos cuidado para obter as medidas em uma boa posição anatômica. Dessa forma, optamos por manter o holótipo.
7- Incluir Upper Pharyngeal anntes de tooth plate, e corrigir a abreviação na figura e legenda.
Resposta: Obrigada pela sugestão, as correções foram realizadas tanto na figura quanto na legenda.
As demais correções solicitadas estão apontadas diretamente no manuscrito.

Associate editor's decision after peer review (09/09/2026).
Dear Ms. Martins:
It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript entitled "Morphological and molecular evidence reveals two new species of Cambeva (Siluriformes: Trichomycteridae) from the rio Paraná basin, Paraná State, Brazil" 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 our Social Media Editor, Igor Souto-Santos, at icass.ufrj@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. George Mattox
Associate Editor, Neotropical Ichthyology
gmattox@ib.usp.br, gmattox@ufscar.br

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.
Published by SBI

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

- **Martins IC, Reis RB, Stabile BHM, Oliveira AV, Graça WJ.** Morphological and molecular evidence reveals two new species of *Cambeva* (Siluriformes: Trichomycteridae) from the rio Paraná basin, Paraná State, Brazil. Neotrop Ichthyol. 2026; 24(4):e250156. https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-0224-2025-0156

Official Journal of the
Sociedade Brasileira de Ictiologia

SBI