For research article

Response to Reviewer X Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions/corrections highlighted/in track changes in the re-submitted files. *[This is only a recommended summary. Please feel free to adjust it. We do suggest maintaining a neutral tone and thanking the reviewers for their contribution although the comments may be negative or off-target. If you disagree with the reviewer's comments please include any concerns you may have in the letter to the Academic Editor.]*

2. Questions for General Evaluation	**Reviewer's Evaluation**	**Response and Revisions**
Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?	Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable	
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable	
Is the research design appropriate?	Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable	
Are the methods adequately described?	Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable	
Are the results clearly presented?	Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable	
Are the conclusions supported by the results?	Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable	

3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1:

Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Page 3, line 117. Distribution of the genus is China (Yunnan), which is incorrect.

Descriptions of new species are very minimalistic. Not even body size of the insects is provided. I would recommend to provide a better descriptions.

Diagnosis. Two newly described species are compared to each other. When new species are described it is advised to compare them with previously known species.

I would strongly recommend to add line drawings for new species to supplement photographs.

Response 1: you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have added the distribution of the genus *Pinopona*, eg. China (Hunan, Hongkong, Yunnan);

Pakistan, India and Nepal. [Page 3, line 117]
About the minimalistic description of new species, your comments are precise, we added the body length of new species. [Page 4, line 172]
We explain that our description of species including diagnostic characters to identify species does not repeat generic characters in details.
We have complemented comparisons and differences between new and known species into the key and the remarks of genus and previously known species. [Page 3, line 125; page 4, line 167]
We agree with your recommendation about the plate of new species description should combined photographs and drawings. Consequently, we added the enlarged figure of aedeagus by drawings to show some fine characters and change the legend [Page 5; Fig. 1]
Additionally, we change the figure number [Page 3, line 141; Page 4, line 171; Page 4, line 189]

Comments 2:
Response 2: Agree. I/We have, accordingly, done/revised/changed/modified…..to emphasize this point.

4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language
Point 1:
Response 1: (in red)
5. Additional clarifications

For review article

Response to Reviewer X Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions/corrections highlighted/in track changes in the re-submitted files. *[This is only a recommended summary. Please feel free to adjust it. We do suggest maintaining a neutral tone and thanking the reviewers for their contribution although the comments may be negative or off-target. If you disagree with the reviewer's comments please include any concerns you may have in the letter to the Academic Editor.]*

2. Questions for General Evaluation	**Reviewer's Evaluation**	**Response and Revisions**
Is the work a significant contribution to the field?		*[Please give your response if necessary. Or you can also give your corresponding response in the point-by-point response letter. The same as below]*
Is the work well organized and comprehensively described?		
Is the work scientifically sound and not misleading?		
Are there appropriate and adequate references to related and previous work?		

Is the English used correct and readable?

3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1: *[Paste the full reviewer comment here.]*

Response 1: *[Type your response here and mark your revisions in red]* Thank you for pointing this out. I/We agree with this comment. Therefore, I/we have….*[Explain what change you have made. Mention exactly where in the revised manuscript this change can be found – page number, paragraph, and line.]*

"[updated text in the manuscript if necessary]"

Comments 2: *[Paste the full reviewer comment here.]*

Response 2: Agree. I/We have, accordingly, done/revised/changed/modified…..to emphasize this point. *Discuss the changes made, providing the necessary explanation/clarification. Mention exactly where in the revised manuscript this change can be found – page number, paragraph, and line.]*

"[updated text in the manuscript if necessary]"

4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language

Point 1:

Response 1: (in red)

5. Additional clarifications

[Here, mention any other clarifications you would like to provide to the journal editor/reviewer.]