

### Review Form 3

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>                     |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_IJPSS_125053   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Harnessing the Potential of Syrphids: Their Role as Bio-Agents and Pollinators</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Review Article</b>   |

#### **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**

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.                        |  |   |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  | yes  |   |
| 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.   | yes  |   |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  | yes  |   |
| 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. |  |   |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.<br>-  | In a review is highly appreciated to include at least one reference of 2024. On the other hand, there are 2 references with a letter, I.E.:<br>- Joseph, A.N. and Parui, P. 1927a. In reference section there isn't a .....1927b<br>- Pineda, A. and Garcia, M. 2008b. In reference section there isn't a .....2008a |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments<br><br>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?   | yes  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  | One minimal suggestion tracked on the manuscript was done. I suggest to approve the manuscript.<br><br><b>SEE ATTACHMENT</b>   |   |

**PART 2:**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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:                            | <b>Gustavo Bich</b>                               |
| Department, University & Country | <b>National University of Misiones, Argentina</b> |