

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

Mariana Trillo¹

¹ Instituto de Investigaciones Biológicas Clemente Estable

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study "Diversity of the Ulidiidae Family (Insecta: Diptera)" seeks to group the available information on the Ulidiidae (Diptera) family. It is a very important work that serves as the basis for future studies in the group. However, at times it was confusing for me to read or understand, and I think it needs to be reviewed in more detail. The review takes a lot of work, and to group the information in an orderly and understandable way.

When I read the title I expected something else, this is a review of the state of knowledge of the family, with its natural history, ecology and general biology.

"Objective: This mini-review aims to describe the Ulidiidae Family." What are you looking to describe? Please explain it and be more detailed.

Abstract

The title is diversity, the goal is to describe the family, and I don't see any results in the abstract. I see the summary very sloppy, it needs to be polished. Please remove the links to web pages from the abstract. What are those link references? Please take them out. What are the results? What is the contribution of the job? Just as I read the summary, it didn't catch me and it already looks confusing. One has to try to catch the reader with the summary.

Introduction

I suggest leaving the figures at the end of the section, it is rare to see one paragraph and 5 or 10 images, reading is cut off. I suggest not to section the introduction.

The objective is not entirely correct, if so, the entire introduction would be results, since the entire introduction describes the family. Please be more specific.

Methods

Please add details. How was it searched? By keywords? What words?

Selected Manuscripts

After figure 32, it says: 2In collecting insects associated with sweet corn (*Zea mays* L.) (Poaceae), during the summer of 1982-1983. in Brasília, DF, the authors found the presence of Diptera larvae of the species":

1982-1983 means 1982-1983?

. in Brasilia:

Brasilia, DF, Brazil? Please add the country.

There is a spot between the year and “in”.

Figures

It seems very important to me to ask the authors of the figures for permission to use them in an article. Are we sure that it was done for each one? For example, in the original of figure 12 it says: “This figure was uploaded by Eusebio Nava.

Content may be subject to copyright.”

In figure 1, please remove the name in blue from the photo. The center is the figure, not the author and title. I would put the author of the photo in the figure caption and add a scale if possible.

Figure 4 is not described in the text, is it? Are the family traits all of those? Ok, please describe them, referring to the figure.

Doesn't it seem more appropriate to make a plate of figures instead of so many figures? I think that this is a good option to make it easier to read, especially at the beginning of the work.

You don't thank anyone? Having 38 figures, I consider that at least the authors of the photos.

In conclusion, it seems to me an important work to know the state of knowledge of the family. However, this requires several revisions and then a resubmission.