SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEA_26238**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Abundance and diversity of insects associated with citrus orchards in two different agroecological zones of Ghana**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**INTRODUCTION:** The introduction does not converge to the objectives of the study. There is much justification, but the reader cannot know that the paper proposes. Just mention the author's aims in the abstract is not enough. Based on this, rearrange the last paragraph of the introduction (lines 43-47). **MATERIALS AND METHODS:** 2.1. Sampling zone: It would be interesting to insert a map that includes the two agro-ecological zones, and indicating the location of citrus orchards (monoculture). 2.4. Data analysis **1.** Why all these indices were chosen? Some of them are redundant with each other. The properties of each should be better studied and only some of them measured. Besides that, they need to be referenced and their formulas cited and explained. Just one example: "We calculated Shannon-Wiener diversity index (H') (Magurran, 1988) according to the equation: H'=-Σ(ni/N)log(ni/N), where ni= number of individuals in the ith species and N= total number of individuals sampled." **Reference:** Magurran, A.E., 1988. Ecological diversity and its measurement. New Jersey: Princeton University. 197 p. **2.** The authors' objectives (in abstract) includes the	Objective of the study has been included Although it would be interesting to see the map of the study area, however, the description of the study sites has been given, and we believe it serves the same purpose. Some of the indices have been removed as suggested by the reviewer

	COMPARISON of two agro-ecological zones. How would they be compared? To compare purposes, statistical analysis is necessary. I suggest an analysis of variance (ANOVA): through it will be possible to evaluate and compare the significant differences between zones, for each calculated index. **3.** Why insects were classified into four functional groups? What is the intention? These results are not discussed… What was the criterion for this categorization? According to Table 1, the four functional groups represent the economic status of species, but in no time it is explained. It seems just a descriptive and loose result! **RESULTS:** The results are descriptive only. One more time: I suggest the ANOVA for comparing the two agro-ecological zones. You can make a box-plot for each calculated index. The x-axis of these graphs will contain the index values and the y-axis will contain two bars: one for Semi-Deciduous Rain Forest and other for Coastal Savannah (two agro-ecological zones). Still, you should inform the F and p values measured by ANOVA. **Table 1:** I know that this inventory is the main result of the paper. However, it is too large. With the inclusion of boxplots, perhaps it may come as supplementary material. **Figures:** If figure 4 is from 1-45, which is the figure 1? The legend of Figure 1 comes before the image itself? I did not understand! It is very confusing and messy! I think that 45 pictures is a lot to be inserted over a document as an article. Make it as supplementary	The main goal of the study was to obtain an inventory of insects associated with citrus, look at the diversity and abundance with the diversity indices. Our comparisons were wholly based on these diversity indices. The grouping of insects has been corrected into 2 main groups, reasons provided and mentioned in the body of the manuscript Our study was to compare the diversity indices from each agroecological zone, although this suggestion might improve the quality of the manuscript, we believe the information provided is enough for the conclusions to be made. Table provided as suggested as supplementary material Figures have been put together as a supplementary material

	material! How figures 2 and 3 appears after figure 4? Completely unordered and confused! It appears that Figures 2 and 3 were prepared in Microsoft Excel software. Consider redo them in another software, specialized for make graphics, because the quality is bad. Standardize the type of font used and make the letters bigger! **DISCUSSION:** I think the Discussion makes a lot of comparing of the present results with the results of other papers. Moreover, it presents many results: lines 220-222, line 225, lines 227-228, line 238, and others. Results in the discussion represent only repeated information, they should not be here. Start talking about the finding of your paper, and discuss in deeper the findings of its own research!!! **CONCLUSION:** The conclusion also contains summarized results ("the presence of 20,285 individual insects belonging to 387 species, 107 families and 13 orders…"). You should be more concise and gentle with yourself: exalt the study findings! **REFERENCES:** See **Minor** REVISION comments.	Have been corrected in the revised manuscript Font sizes have been changed. The discussion section has been corrected as according to the reviewer's recommendations Conclusion, this has also been corrected

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	**1.** Agroecological or agro-ecological? The two terms are used throughout the text. Try to adopt only one and always use the same; **2.** For which reason you analysed two different agro-ecological zones? Is there any different expectation (hypothesis) for each of the zones? The intention is just a simple comparison? **3.** Some keywords are repeated of the title, such as insect diversity, abundance and citrus. This is a common mistake! I suggest that other worlds should be used. In terms of search, it makes the paper "more visible"; **4.** References should be reviewed and standardized, because there is inconsistences. DOI number is necessary? If yes, why some papers are referenced with it and others not? Further, when employed, it has been done in different ways. Please, see lines 296-297; 300-301 and 308-309: DOI referenced in 03 different ways. Standardize according to the journal's standards; **3.** In general, references are outdated. There are a few of the years 2014 and 2013. Try to mention studies that are more recent!	Changes made as made The intention has been stated in the objective Changes made Those references with DOI numbers have been indicated Have done that
Optional/General comments	**1.** In general, the manuscript is very descriptive. It is in according with journal scope, but I made suggestions in order to make it more interesting and attractive. Please, see **Compulsory** REVISION comments and **Minor** REVISION comments; **2.** I suggest a review of the English language. It would be interesting if the writing were made in the first person, it would make the text more objective and elegant. For example:	The English has been improved and corrections have been made to the best of our knowledge.

	In line 7: **were investigated**; change to: we investigated In line 9: **the objectives of the study were identify**; change to: we aim to identify In line 12: **were recorded**; change to: we recorded In lines 16-17: **this study recommends**; change to: we recommended I highlighted some examples observed in abstract. However, it is interesting to make changes throughout the text.	