



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_12469
Title of the Manuscript:	Side effects of sublethal concentration of two Neonicotinoids; Thiamethoxam and Thiacloprid on the larval parasitoid, Bracon brevicornis (Hymenoptera: Braconidae)
Type of the 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There are numerous spelling and formatting errors, with more repeated sentences and words in the text. Language and grammar should be checked by native speaker. Abstract should be revised according to the author guideline. It should contain the contents of the paper. Different sub-sections as "Aims, Study design, Place and Duration of study, Methodology, Results, Conclusion" should include. Besides, it should include relevant statistics results. Conclusion part after discussion should be given in a separate title and state major finding. A general agreement on the results should be given. Furthermore, according to the results of the study should be emphasized in future research to be done in conclusion part. Discussion part is poor, should be rewritten. Statistical lettering was missing in Table 1, should be added. The same data or information given in a Table must not be repeated in result and discussion parts of the text. It is not acceptable to repeat extensively the numbers from Tables in the text or to give lengthy explanations of Tables.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Keywords should be rearranged, as "<i>Bracon brevicornis</i>, <i>Spodoptera littoralis</i>, Neonicotinoids, Thiamethoxam, Thiacloprid, insecticide, sublethal dose, toxicity, parasitoid". In abstract, Line 7, <i>Bracon brevicornis</i> should include author name, order and family, as "(Wesmael) (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) at first appearance; in Line 10, <i>Spodoptera littoralis</i> also should include author name, order and family, as "Boisd. (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) at first appearance, Then, should be shortened. Also, some Latin names of insects have no author name, family and order; it should be added especially in discussion part. In introduction, Line 22, IPM should be written in clear with long name, abbreviation should be in parenthesis at first occurrence, and then abbreviation should be used. In introduction, the purpose and requirements of the study should be more clearly emphasized and explained especially in the last paragraph. Methodology of the study should be supported with reference for each part. Which experimental design was used to assess the statistically, should be given clearly. Company locations should be given in material and method. How many individuals and repetitions were used in direct toxicity to the parasitoid adults by spray method should be clearly stated in the text? Statement regarding	We arranged them as the suggestion. Yes, we added them in the text. We added it We did more explanation We added the references Randomized Complete Design (RCD) We added them We added the individuals and replicates
---------------------------------------	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	mortality rate which was examined should be written to the method, and supported with reference. The results regarding mortality rate are inadequate. It should be added to the text. Also, it should be given in the table. In conclusion, Line 124, sex ratio should be corrected as male:female ratio. In discussion, Line 169, the statement and reference should be revised. Comments in the discussion part inadequate. Statements from the Results sections should not be repeated in discussion part. <i>P</i> values should be italicized and capitalized, besides, expressed to 2 digits whether or not it is significant (<i>P</i> =.01 or <i>P</i> =.05) Units of characters should be added to the tables and in the text Besides, statistical units missing should be added. (e.g. days $\pm$SE, etc...). Tables should be placed inside the text. Tables should be presented as per their appearance in the text. The discussion about the tables should appear in the text before the appearance of the respective tables. Tables should be revised according to the format, as well as title and footnote of table. Double spacing should be maintained throughout the table.	It is in the text and, we are thinking that not important to be in Table because only 2 numbers. There are two methods to calculate sex ratio. Both of them are correct. We used the another way. Yes We summarized this section Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The punctuation signals are not compatible with instruction. Only recommended SI units should be used. Acknowledgements part should be added to the text to thank for materials used in the study. Title of reference should not be in capital letters. References should follow according to the instruction, should be checked again. Journal names are abbreviated according to the ISSN List of Title Word Abbreviations. The punctuation signals are not compatible with instruction, should be revised.	We revised them The material not be supported from any project. We revised them We checked them We revised Journal names
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Manuscript should be checked again according to the author guideline. Corrections and suggestions should be taken into consideration, and shortcomings should be completed.	