

SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_118364
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation Of Feeding Potential Of Mexican Beetle (ZYGOGRAMMA BICOLORATA) On Carrot Grass (PARTHENIUM HYSTEROPHORUS) In Dehradun District, Uttarakhand, India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The author has accepted the major edits in the manuscript that was made by the reviewer and highlighted in the manuscript. Some images related to the methodology and a table representing the data for only choice tests were also given.</p> <p>However, the questions raised by the reviewer in the reviewed manuscript is still not seriously addressed by the author.</p> <p>In the introduction section:</p> <p>Still lacks the major references to support the literature Still the objective/ aim of the study is not given</p> <p>Methodology is still lacking the information on the laboratory experiment and the experiments in several locations. The methodology is not clear to be repeated by the others.</p> <p>Authors failed to address the following comments that was raised in the reviewed manuscript.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add your GPS locations of your selected areas • Only male insects or mixture of both?? • Why did you collect it from both leaves and flowers? • Mention the maturity stage of the leaves. • Write the little modifications that you have done compared to Jaiswal et al?? • Could you please rewrite the methods of experiment conducted in the selected 10 regions and the laboratory experiment separately? <p>The author stated the food consumption of the beetle for choice and non-choice test was conducted in the laboratory conditions. However, they have failed to provide the results for both tests instead they have provided the data for only choice test.</p> <p>Statistical analysis related aspects are not clearly stated in the methods</p> <p>The discussion part still lacking to provide supportive findings and based on their lack of the information provided in the methodology, we can't comment the validity on the discussion.</p> <p>The conclusion is still not written based on the objectives of the study.</p> <p>In addition, except Dhurgude et al. (2022), the references in the reference list are not</p>	<p>All the references have been corrected in the manuscript. The title of the research article is itself the objective of the research (Evaluation of feeding Potential of Z.bicolorata)</p> <p>Details added in the methodology. Same method was used for all the 10 sites. Only Z.bicolorata and Parthenium was collected from the 10 sites. Experiment was performed in the laboratory.</p> <p>GPS images of all the sites are unavailable at the moment. Both male and female were collected randomly. No differentiation on the basis of sex of the insect done. We are studying only the general feeding potential of the insect irrespective of its sex. Z.bicolorata feeds on both leaves and flowers. Maturity stage of leaves is not the part of my work. My main focus is only on the insect. Though it feeds on the leaves of all stages. Material method has been given in a bit more detail. Same method was applied for all ten sites and done at the same laboratory. Only choice test was performed. It has been rectified in the manuscript and details of readings are given in the table.</p> <p>Statistical analysis is in the table provided and the data in only of one year. This paper is entirely based on that.</p> <p>Conclusion states that the insect feeds on Parthenium and destroys it completely. All the stages of the insect feed on this weed and hence, they can be used as a biocontrol against the weed. References updated.</p>

SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

cited in the text in the manuscript.	
--------------------------------------	--