

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_92148
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of larval diet on pupal period and size of cocoon of <i>Chrysoperla zastrowi sillemi</i> (Esben-Peterson)
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:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>This draft was focused on understanding how the diet in the larval period influences the pupal period of <i>Chrysoperla zastrowi</i>. Overall, the work is relevant to the field and easy to understand, but it sounds few scientific. The draft has some writing issues that need meticulous editing by the authors.</p> <p>The introduction highlights the main protagonist in the text , but does not exhibit the potential importance of research. Moreover, the major argument is based on the "quite obvious" assumption that "rearing of natural enemies in the laboratory with preferred food will positively influence the duration and vigor of different life stages, which in turn will increase the feeding potentiality in the field after release," but lack of good support for this assumption. Furthermore, no solid biological hypothesis is being tested, which might be an issue. I think that it should be rethinking.</p> <p>There is no clear and robust statistical analysis presented in the methods, which affect the presentation of results. The discussion is poor and does not adequately explore the results, creating the impression that the authors' best efforts yielded results comparable to those of other authors, diminishing the study's importance.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	I strongly suggest authors to consult the extensive bibliography available on the importance and management of biological controllers.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Raul Marques Pisno
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Viçosa, Brazil