

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_ARJA_117999
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of population dynamics of Syrphid fly (Order- Diptera, Family- Syrphidae) in ITM University Gwalior.
Type of the Article	

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Important for scientific community</b>, because it can provide an overview and study of the population dynamics of Syrphid fly (Order- Diptera, Family- Syrphidae) in the region.</p> <p>2. <b>The title of the article is appropriate</b>, but the data presented in the article is too little, maybe you need to add variables or related data to support the population dynamics of Syrphid fly.</p> <p>3. <b>The abstract is comprehensive</b>, but there are some suggestions that need to be added</p> <p>4. <b>there are subsections and manuscript structures that have not been conveyed, namely discussions not found in Original Manuscript_ARJA_117999</b></p> <p>5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically correct</b>, but needs to be improved in accordance with the suggestions given.</p> <p>6. <b>The references provided are inadequate and not up-to-date and few (because there is no discussion in Original Manuscript_ARJA_117999). Therefore, I suggest updating the last 5 years.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. <b>The English quality of the article is suitable for scientific communication</b>, but it is recommended that it be proofread by a language institute.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>need to be improved in accordance with the suggestions given, especially related to the discussion of research</p>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Amsar Maulana</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Andalas, Indonesia</b>