

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_98597</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of distance from wetland borders on Hymenopteran wasps and spider abundance in Maize-soybean cropping system</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. <b>The research idea is good and leads to better thinking for the future</b> 2. <b>The title is possible although there is limitation</b> 3. <b>abstract is written well</b> 4. <b>some very important section like means of data analysis is missed</b> 5. <b>More or less good although it lacks some clarity</b> 6. <b>the specimen collection and sampling techniques misses some reality</b> 7. <b>Some references are missed from either the text or reference section</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	More or less good but some long and complex sentences must be shortened. The exaggerated findings reporting also used in the text. The reason of killing and collection of insects is not clearly stated.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It is better if major revision is made to make the paper more readable and scientifically sound. Please see the correction and comments made on the article by using track and change	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Mohammed Kasso Geda</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia</b>