



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_39074
Title of the Manuscript:	Occurrence of grape phylloxera Daktulosphaira vitifoliae Fitch (Hemiptera: Phylloxeridae) in the state of Espirito Santo, Brazil
Type of the Article	Short 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	General comments A new species is reported for a region of Brazil, which is important for the viticulture production of that country. The publication of this paper is of interest. However, some modifications are suggested to improve the quality of the paper. To make the first report of a species in a site would be enough to find it in a plant and in a single locality, and you publish a note. However, this research is more complete, includes three sites, monthly sampling, etc. what is not reflected well in the text. The introduction is very brief, the methodology is not very explicit, the results do not present data on the incidence or severity of the damage and the discussion needs to be complemented. It is far from the word limit for this kind of paper, so it could be more explicit. Abstract When you said “plant samples” detail please cultivar, if you collect roots, leaves Introduction Lines 20-21: add "depending if the species are European or American" Lines 27-30: It would be very important to describe the characteristics of these vineyards, more planted cultivars, if they are grafted and on which rootstocks, because this information is essential to support the hypothesis of the incidence level that phylloxera could present in Espirito Santo. Material and methods / experimental details / methodology Line 41: "The samples were randomly" What was the sample size? How many plants per hectare or per vineyard? How many leaves, how many roots did you take? Line 47: When Niagara Rosada was grafted, what was the rootstock? In this case, it was not verified that it was colonized by phylloxera? American rootstocks are tolerant, which means that phylloxera can feed on them without causing damage. Results and discussion Lines 65-66: “all the samples” How many plants were infested? How many leaves and roots? How many galls per leaf? You said: “monthly sampling was carried out during different stages of grapevine plant and production development”, in all months and stages of grapevine phylloxera was present? It would be very important that you give some idea of the incidence and severity of the damage caused by this insect in those vineyards. Line 66: Did you find phylloxera on roots of rootstocks? This contradicts what is detailed in materials and methods, please clarify in that section if you only examined roots of plants without grafting or grafting as well.	The cultivars and collection of leaves and roots was detailed in the text. Was added. The characteristics of the vineyards were described. Sample information has been entered. The plants were grafted with rootstocks 'IAC 572 Jales' and IAC 766 Campinas' and were colonized by phylloxera, without damage. Incidence data would really be of great help to the public. However, we do not have this data. The work was carried out only with the intention of identifying which was the species of insect that was colonizing the grape plantations. Unfortunately we do not currently have staff to do this survey on incident level and we regret that it was not done. Yes, in less quantity. The grafted and ungrafted plants were evaluated. Was clarified in the section.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 68: “phylloxera, <i>D. vitifoliae</i>, for the first time in the State of Espirito Santo, Brazil” Line 71: In botany it is considered that the abaxial side of the leaf is the underside, it legend is wrong, A is abaxial (lower leaf surface) and B adaxial (upper leaf surface) Line 77: “in the roots” This is not absolutely true, some time ago phylloxera attacks have been detected on leaves of <i>Vitis vinifera</i> plants in Europe and South America, including Brazil (Botton & Walker 2009). (Review updated bibliography, eg Molnar et al., 2009, Powell et al. 2013, Vidart et al 2013, Bao et al 2014, Forneck 2015, Foreck & Powell 2016) Line 83-84: Clarify, it is not understood. Botton et al 2014 do not say that Line 88: “<i>V. rupandi</i>” I think it should be <i>V. rupestris</i> References Line 117: The guidelines of the journal accept 15 to 20 references, here are 25. I suggest prioritize the most current references and revisions, and omit those reiterate concepts that others have already expressed. Lines 172-175: add line spacing between references 18 and 19	Commas were added. The caption has been corrected. There was a mistake in that statement. We exclude the sentence. We exclude the sentence. The correct one is <i>V. rupestris</i>. It was corrected. The references were revised and despite our effort to reduce the proposed guidelines (15 to 20 references), we reached a total of 22 references. The authors understand that the adaptation to the number of 20 references can compromise the quality of the work and apologize for not meeting this requirement. Line spacing has been added.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		