



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_39795
Title of the Manuscript:	Functional response of two egg parasitoid of Trichogramma (Hymenoptera: Trichogrammatidae) genre on Duponchelia fovealis Zeller (Lepidoptera: Crambidae) eggs
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	1. What is the potential of these Trichogramma species to parasitize? Until this is known, it may be assumed that eggs densities provided were few and this may lead to superparasitism. Find space for this probably in the materials and methods and provide reasons why you specifically used such densities 2. Your study was a laboratory study, how would this compare with field studies. You need to include this in your discussion. Is there evidence of performance in the field?	1. A brief explanation has been described in materials and methods. Egg densities were defined in preliminary tests that resulted in a potential for maximum parasitism around 20 parasitized eggs. As a result, the densities of 25 and 30 eggs were placed as the upper margin and the points of the response curve were completed. 2. 2. Most functional response studies are performed in the laboratory where conditions are controlled. The authors agree that field performance is extremely important for biological control. But innumerable factors are involved in field parasitism, and the authors think it would be wrong to make comparisons with laboratory studies. In the discussion, the authors made comparisons between species of <i>Trichogramma</i> and hosts, relating the parameters of functional response.
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: Correct the statement “a functional response bioassay was performed..... And different egg ages of the host -to read-different egg densities of the host. I don’t see the aspect of age being examined in this manuscript. Page 1, line 21, delete “s” from causes and add “d” to read caused line 22, reference 7 appears many times, what does this mean. Delete the others line 32, I don’t understand the use of “created” in this sentence, replace with “reared” In your introduction, it would be useful to the reader to understand the different types of functional response and their importance or significance Line 53, replace “created” with “reared” Line 54, replace “formed” with “reared” Line 56, Replace “creations” with “colonies”. I don’t know what exactly you mean here Line 70, replace “submitted” with “subjected” and “confirm” with “determine or investigate”. I guess you want to find if your response variables have effects or not. In line 73 to 78, what was your research question (s)? This is not clear here Table 1, There are no letters in the rows as stated. Only upper case letters are notable in the columns. Line 128, there is no need to state that “no confidence interval	The abstract has been fixed. It has changed to "caused". Excess references have been withdrawn. It has changed to "reared". The types of functional response are explained in the discussion. It has changed to "reared". It has changed to "reared". It has changed to "insects were reared". Was changed. Exactly. In these lines, functional response analyzes were described. The letters in the lines are only in "density 10" because in the other lines the result was not significant. Was changed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	overlap.....observed”, simply say “the differences were significant.....” Line 155, like I mentioned before, you can’t speculate about maximum reproductive capacity without giving the potential number of eggs that the Trichogramma species could really parasitize! Refer to the earlier comment above. Line 185, you state that your study’s “short handling time and higher search efficiency” was a good results. What is the significance of this? Mention that here In the references, reference 18 seems to be missing in the text?	The potential number of eggs that <i>Trichogramma</i> species can actually parasitize does not apply to a bioassay because several factors influence parasitism. It is well known that most insect parasitoids do not lay eggs at random, but select an appropriate host for the development of their progeny. They achieve this by going through a sequence of behavioural steps, which usually include habitat location, host location, host acceptance, and oviposition proper. In the absence of appropriate stimuli, females do not oviposit. However, conditions vary in time and space and sometimes unpredictably. To cope with this diversity, insects are capable of modifying their oviposition behaviour and oogenesis. Therefore, I can not compare my results with the maximum potential of the Trichogramma species because for each host the stimuli of the females are different. In our study, we suggested that one of the factors that may have influenced to result in functional type II response is the reproductive capacity of <i>Trichogramma</i> to the host <i>Duponchelia fovealis</i>. In the case of another host, the reproductive potential could be different. However, this is not the purpose of this study. Within the biological control proposal of <i>D. fovealis</i>, we believe that the functional response study can estimate the oviposition potential of the evaluated <i>Trichogramma</i> species. It was mentioned. Reference 18 is at line 55.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript will contribute to the understanding of the potential for use of the two parasitoids in biological control. The paper would however improve greatly appropriate scientific terms are used in certain areas pointed out.	