

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_125053
Title of the Manuscript:	Harnessing the Potential of Syrphids: Their Role as Bio-Agents and Pollinators
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study carried out by the author(s) is interesting and meaningful. This manuscript is well structured and written (Title, Abstract, Introduction, Bibliographical revision Conclusion and References). However, some update and modifications are required before being accepted for publication. SEE ATTACHMENT	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is extremely long; it has 465 words. The main objective is missing. It must be rewritten.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, they are not	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	There is no scientific evidence since it is a review without a proper hypothesis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, it is.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is.	
Optional/General comments	The Introduction section is extremely long. It has 8 paragraphs, the main problem to be analysed went missing along the write up. The main objective is missing.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Edwin Ronnie Gakegne
Department, University & Country	Instituto Superior Politecnico Caala (ISPCAALA), Angola