



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_49543
Title of the Manuscript:	Potential of entomopathogenic fungi as biological control agent of whitefly (<i>Bemisia tabaci</i> biotype B) (Genn.) (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae)
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Introduction :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Give more information regarding <i>Bemisia tabaci</i> basic biology <p>Material and Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I think you should explain somewhere why you chose these fungi and not others. Do they have any specificity? Do they have a very high pathogenicity level on other, similar insects? - You should also add some information regarding the LC50 values <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In my opinion, the discussion is way too short. I'd like to know if the results are similar to what was found with other fungi, and on other, similar insect species for instance. In the conclusion, you should also keep in mind that biocontrol with fungi is most of the time part of "Integrated Pest Management" strategies that include other biocontrol solutions, that sometimes act synergistically (or not). Maybe emphasize the fact that your results are only based on lab experiments, and that even though some isolates showed very good results, it is not possible to extrapolate to the field yet. 	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Answer: Novel information about the <i>B. tabaci</i> biology was given and a new reference was included. <p>Material and Methods:</p> <p>Answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>B. bassiana</i> and <i>L. muscarium</i> was chosen because of your pathogenicity against whitefly and we are investigating further for new isolates that can be high toxicity and being used in formulated products in the future for this pest control. It was lightly implicit in the fourth paragraph of the introduction, but novel information was given in order to be clearer in the introduction and the last of discussion paragraph. - New information more detailed about the lethal concentration was given.
Minor REVISION comments	I've added minor comments and question directly on the manuscript	Thanks for all the comments and suggestions, the manuscript was corrected point by point.
Optional/General comments	I think your manuscript would gain in clarity if the English was corrected by a native speaker	The article was corrected meticulously.

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	