

# Review of: "Diversity of the Ulidiidae Family (Insecta: Diptera)"

Ian Burgess

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article appears to have cut and pasted unrelated information into the Abstract and into the text at 1.4 Life cycle. The article is about relatively small dipterans that breed in vegetable matter but some of the pasted text refers to birds: **"They walk steadily on strong legs and big toes, pecking for food as they go. Many have interesting mating displays, such as inflating throat sacs or raising elaborate feather crests. The female lays three to five dark, speckled eggs in a scratch in the ground and incubates them on her own."** This needs to be reexamined and erroneous text deleted.

An extensive literature search claims to have been made but only 18 references are cited. This seems strangely limited for such an extensive subject covering several hundreds of species, especially since most of the citations appear to have been copied from Wikipedia.

All images included are taken from other publications, and although cited as sources does this reuse have permissions associated with it, otherwise there could be copyrighting issues.

In section 1.3: Bioecology, the last "paragraph" consists of incomplete sentences as follows: **Information about Neomyennis, however, the larvae of Ottidae (Utilidae) usually develop in organic matter at the beginning of decomposition. Euxesta species and Pterocerine are normally associated .**

**With monocotyledonea plants, which in a way justifies their abundance. Some Euxesta species, even, can affect corn cob candy damaged by caterpillars of Lepidoptera"** These need to be corrected to read properly and convey complete information.

I do not understand the purpose of the section 1.5 Taxonomy. After the short introductory paragraph there is just a list of a few genera followed by a random selection of species names with no particular reason for their inclusion and no other information provided about any of them.

Section 1.6 Objective, states that the article is a mini review but is little more in scope than a Dorling Kindersley-type of presentation that might be found in a book for older children. It has no scientific merit and a reader would do better to go to some of the documents from which the images were taken.

Section 2 Methodology. this section makes a high sounding claim for the literature searches but even a 5 minute search in Google Scholar would produce a much more extensive literature than is cited here.

Section 3 Selected Manuscripts. This section is a hotch-potch of facts and factoid case studies that are unrelated

including bits of predations, anatomy, and pest status, and a control method. There is no obvious systematic flow and each of the case studies is not really “stand alone” either. There needs to be a systematic description of each of the concepts approached here. If you want to write a proper review it should be thoroughly researched and set out in a manner that leads the reader through a progressions so that they can understand all aspects of the topic, in this cases starting with the biology and anatomy, following with the behaviour, the pest status, natural predators, methods of control, etc. A short series of vignettes does not achieve this.

Section 4 Conclusion. This section is not a conclusion as it brings into the manuscript an apparently randomly selected brief comment about two *Euxesta* species and their relationship with maize. A proper conclusion is a summing up of findings of the whole of the manuscript preceding.

My Conclusion, having read and commented upon the manuscript, is that it requires considerably more work, it also requires more information, and a general rewrite because currently it falls well below the level of scholarship I would expect from an informative review.