



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_8865
Title of the Manuscript:	Behavioral Responses of Cotesia vestalis (Haliday) (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) to Honey-based Diets
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript is well planned. The selection of research model is suitable and allowed to obtain reliable results. The results and discussion is very compact but logical and easy to follow. However, the results have been hardly compared to the results of other authors.	Thank you. I have related the results to earlier reports.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. I would suggest an introductory sentence needs which factors affect food-foraging apart from olfaction (Line 41) 2. Was it enough to observe the <i>C. vestalis</i> females for only 20 s in one of the arms as showing no response?	1. I have added an introductory sentence 2. 20 s observation periods is a standard procedure. It is enough to determine decisions
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I have some minor comments and suggestion. In my opinion the manuscript should be accepted for the publication in the American Journal of Experimental Agriculture.	