SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_30789**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Survey and exclusion study to explore for natural enemies in Ghana for the Control of Aerial yam (Dioscorea bulbifera L.) in Florida, USA**
Type of the Article	**Original Research paper**

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	Abstract: I think it could be reworded a bit: put Coleoptera and Lepidoptera together in the results (i.e. underline low and high damage, vs. narrow and wide host ranges respectively). In the conclusion give a hint of eventual tradeoff between biocontrol and environmental safety issues. L26-32. It could be interesting to add a brief mention of the wider interest of the problem, which would likely add interest to your paper. Consider also the journal were you attempting to publish is called international. L86. Three replicates for each? I.e. 3 for insecticide protection and 3 for no protection? L95. Data collection of what? Is this relative to the experiment (2.2)? Clarify. L96. Better "Data were"; You might change "in a systematic sampling fashion" to "with a systematic sampling". L97. "On each sampled plant, all leaves were counted as well as damaged ones." Not clear. All healthy as well as damaged leaves? L97. What is a mound here? I searched on an agronomy dictionary and did not find it. You might consider using a different word.	

	L99-101. Veneer … is a Vernier caliper? Scored with a scoring scale? Showed > showing. Please consider checking English quality and clarity of this section (2.3). L104. I would say that the control is “protected” by insecticides, where no effect of herbivores could be found, not the opposite as you state. Anyway, state what is a control before, when you talk about treatments in L86. L110. Consider changing “documented” with recorded. L113. It does not matter if the lamp is rechargeable. Instead, you might state type and power of you lamp. L117. You are referring to a standard procedure that can be read where? Reference n. 17 is of little use as it has no title. Please, refer to a link where the report can be downloaded, or change ref to a published paper that can be eventually read. L118-119. “Feeding guilds were also determined”. How? Please make reference to the texts used to get information about specie biology, or what is pertinent. L125 “statistically” is superfluous. Consider cutting it. L133. Do you mean “Local communities”? I mean, human settlements? L137-138. So you did not consider those transient specimens? Please, state it. L134 and 139. I don’t understand coherence of the two sentences: only central with both wild and cultivated or what? Additionally, Table 1 does not help clarifying this	

	aspect. Table 1 should be corrected to clearly state where wild and cultivated Discorea were found. L151. Consider changing “admitted” to “stated”. L133-153. In general I don’t understand exactly what are you trying to say with this section (which should be numbered and titled, as it does not present the following sections). You might consider reorganizing presentation of results and try to work out a bit more what you want to say here. Did you find many insects or very few? You did not find insects on the wild plant? I think you should also state in the methods the effort in these surveys as number of men/days/nights. L155. Information presented here and in table 2 is not enough. State how many insects you found per plant and per insect species (stating also how many plants you searched with surveys). You need to provide an idea about how many insect were found per plant and per insect species so that a gradient of relative abundance could be inferred. L172-174. Some insects were encountered? State exactly how you searched for insects in the experimental plants, and how many insect you found as above. If you want to convince readers that you found some relevant insect for controlling the plant you need to state insect abundance and sampling effort. You might have got some problem with sampling (i.e. you found some damage but insects were absent). Consider revising the manuscript to state clearly these aspects. Additionally, you refer again to ref n. 17, which is of little use. L188-189. I think you cannot state this, as you	

	searched the plant exactly at the fringes of forests following major roads (L63-64). L192-194. I don't think you showed data that allowed you to understand (not even guess) factors determining the low incidence of the aerial yam in Ghana. L203. Laboratory investigations? Where did you describe these? L214-216. You don't have rodents in Florida? I don't understand well the point here. Where are the data to state that rodents are biocontrol in Ghana? And why rodent effect should differ in Florida? L217-218. Not convincing at all. If you had money to invest for the biocontrol of the species, given available knowledge, would you: 1) finance more search in other potentially native areas of the plant, or 2) evaluate environmental risk and spread the insects in Florida. I would go for the 2nd as I have the impression that you gathered some sparse preliminary knowledge. You could perhaps do some experiment to evaluate growth potential of the best biocontrol candidates. The manuscript is not convincing on these aspect. L 214-229. I don't understand how this discussion pertains to this investigation. Discuss your surveys, your experiments, your data and the (many) limits of your study. This is going to be more useful for readers. I don't think you can say much about biocontrol and selectivity of natural enemies of the plant right now. Consider also revising the whole manuscript as a short note to present the most important data gathered with your effort.	

	L240. Two Lepidoptera were easily reared? Did you describe a rearing experiment? Where? It is not very clear what is from your study and what is from something else. Table 1. Formatting is not clear. Table 2. “Specificity”: I missed what is and how was it measured in the text (y, b, x??). If absent add these info somewhere. Fig 1. Add some more info and try to preset a nicer map. What are the points? Samples or localities with plants? Not clear. Fig. 2. Check axes length, units, resolution. They are not well presented. Consider also putting % damaged in the y axes. Similar comments for all figures, which need to be considerably improved. You might consider cutting them and resting on significance of differences. Plate 4 and 5. Some pictures are blurred. I think more effort must be done to improve its presentation. I attempted to provide suggestions. I suggested as a short note could be given,	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Several comments are above. As the manuscript has to be seriously revised in major and minor aspects, I put all my comments within the compulsory revision comments.	
Optional/General comments	This manuscript is not well written (apart from the introduction). Method and results needs more specifications (as I attempted to explain in the compulsory revision comments). Discussion and conclusion go too far from what the study can actually tell, and the presentation is also confusing. I think more work need to be done on this preliminary investigation. The manuscript could be possibly shortened and presented as a short note. Indeed, there is some information in this investigation that could be useful for further surveys, but I don't think you can tell much about natural enemies of Aerial yam.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Paolo Casula***
Department, University & Country	**Centre for Population Biology, Division of Biology, Imperial College London, Silwood Park Campus, UK**