



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAHR_43462</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Field studies on supper parasitism of the larval pupal endoparasitoid <i>Opius pallipes</i> on the tomato leaf miner <i>Liriomyza bryoniae</i> and the serpentine leaf miner <i>Liriomyza trifolii</i> in Libya</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment (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)</b>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Genus name had been misspelled as <i>Opuis</i> and should be changed to <i>Opius</i> in the manuscript.</p> <p>Further, <i>bryonia</i> need to be changed as <i>bryoniae</i> (line 107-112).</p> <p>Discussion part largely concentrated and referenced from earlier laboratory based studies (102- 112 lines). It could be avoided as the present study focuses on seasonal dynamics at field level. It has been suggested to merge the results and discussion with more emphasis given on discussion relevant to field studies.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Materials and Methods need to be written in little more coherent manner improving consistency and language.</p> <p>In conclusion part (114-116), the statement ".....low preference towards <i>L. Trifolii</i> " need to be justified since data suggest that of more parasitisation in <i>L. Trifolii</i> in comparison to <i>L. bryoniae</i></p> <p><b>Plagiarism Issue-</b> Large part of the Introduction has been taken word by word simply from other publication and I am afraid that article might fall in plagiarism if sufficient revision has not been made. <i>Sharanowski et al. 2014</i>; Link: <a href="https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262219451">https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262219451</a> <i>Fischer et al., 2013</i>; Link: <a href="http://journals.tubitak.gov.tr/zoology/issues/zoo-13-37-5/zoo-37-5-1-1204-9.pdf">http://journals.tubitak.gov.tr/zoology/issues/zoo-13-37-5/zoo-37-5-1-1204-9.pdf</a></p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The study was undertaken to study the superparasitism behaviour of <i>O.pallipes</i>. The study was only based on field level population dynamics of parasitoid viv-a-vis host leaf miners. It would have been more conclusive if detailed laboratory study based on parasitoid oviposition behaviour in relation to different number of leaf miner infected leaves was conducted. I feel that field level population dynamics as well as laboratory study could have generated wholesome information on superparasitism behaviour. Nevertheless, the present study provides insight into field level superparasitism of <i>O.pallipes</i> which is generally considered as solitary parasitoid in relation to two different leaf miners.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Mahendran B</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Indian Agricultural Research Institute, India</i></b>