

# Review of: "[Mini Review] The Family Micropezidae (Insecta: Diptera)"

Léo Rodrigo Ferreira Louzeiro<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Instituto Biológico

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

This Mini Review entitled "The Family Micropezidae (Insecta: Diptera)" (Qeios ID: 9UPXZ6 -<https://doi.org/10.32388/9UPXZ6>) shows a compilation of information about the insect family Micropezidae. The paper appear to merit publication. My recommendation is Accept pending Major Revision.

Although I am from Latin America and I do not perform perfectly in English I recommend the authors have their paper revised by a native English speaker. Below is a list of suggestions.

1. In Abstract, the text is the same as presented in the item Introduction and Methods. The summary could be presented with other text. Add scientific name for ginger. Add final thoughts or conclusions.
2. In Introduction, the introduction should be used to justify and present the objectives. However, the introduction is a presentation of separate information. Why do some Micropezidae mimic ants and wasps? the answer to this question could be presented in the introduction. The item "1.5. Objective" is not clear. I could add information about the complete life cycle of micropezidae (egg, larva, pupa and adult) and the average period that each stage of the life cycle lasts. Could you add an item on Micropezidae biogeography in South America or Brazil.
3. In Manuscript selection, what are studies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5? They were not presented in Methods or here. Add what each study is about or a specific topic for each study. It appears that the author performed insect collection experiments, but these experiments were not described in Methods or here. Or the study items are a summary of the literature consulted and cited. It's confusing for me.
4. In Conclusions, it is the repetition of the text presented in the Abstract, Introduction and Methods.
5. Several insect figures are distorted and some insect details are not visible. Often the information presented in the text does not correspond to the figures cited in the respective text.
6. Some scientific names are accompanied by the author in the first citation while others are not.
7. There is little or no relationship between Title, Objectives and Conclusions. The Methods are not very detailed. Manuscript selection is not clear.