



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_24819
Title of the Manuscript:	Population dynamics of the mango mealybug <i>Rastrococcus invadens</i> Williams (Homoptera: Pseudococcidea) in Western Burkina Faso
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The article has important field work data from pest and natural enemies that are useful for the development of a integrated pest management program of the mango tree mealybug. However, the reported results of population dynamics with regard to environmental factors are not conclusive and diminish the final quality of the work. These environmental data should be analysed with other statistical tools or grouped in a single data group looking to increase its certainty. In my opinion, seasonal variation data and percentages of parasitism are well done. Abiotic data analyses are very inconclusive. The option are reanalyzed statistically or omit them from the results and submit the manuscript again	All data collected from the three study sites were grouped and submitted to multivariate analysis with SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 19.0.1 software.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The study design and place-duration of the study are correct. The methodology is appropriate except in the point that relativity humidity and temperature cannot be collected in two of the locations and its statistical analysis is not conclusive. The discussion (references to other works) is not well distributed in all result section and is focused in section 3.5. The graphics and tables can be improved but very understandable. Conclusions and references are correct	Relative humidity and temperature could not be collected in two locations because there is no facility there for that. The discussion was re-organized so that it could cover all parts of the results. The graphics and tables were also improved.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Specific point where the manuscript can be improved:	All these points were addressed directly in the manuscript (see sections in green).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	1. In the abstract (results section) also specifies the effect of abiotic factors on pest populations. 2. The conclusion (abstract) is not related with the title of the manuscript. Although parasitoids are included into the study is not the main objective of the study. 3. When and where were made the prospect studies (lines 50-51)? 4. Question: Figure 1 has French legends? 5. Spelling mistake in line 66 "During <u>theses</u> observations" 6. Specify if the examined leaves were removed or remained on the tree 7. In the line 116 (and others sections) don't start the paragraph with the figure number. Change the redaction as "The evolution of the population density of and parasitized <i>R. invadens</i> in the Toussiana is illustrated in the Figure 2." 8. Simplify the scale of sampling dates (one data per 1 or 2 months) in the graphs (horizontal scale) and write with letters the months of the study for better understanding. 9. In section 3.4 there is any explanation about causes of mortality 10. For section 3.5 the analysis of linear regression looks so simple to explain abiotic factor and populations (pest, parasitoids). I suggest a multivariate analysis 11. As suggestion, maybe grouping the data of the three study locations significance in statistical analysis of some population dynamics can be reached 12. In the lines 187-188 clarify the sentence "the negative effect of rainfalls was significant . . ." (for whom?) 13. Lines 219-220 mentioned pathogens and predators cause nature regulation but there is no experimental evidence of that assertion. I suggest eliminate the sentence.	
--	--	--