



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	The manuscript is very close to its final version to be published. I include some suggestions for improvement	Response: Very thanks for the positive opinion. Each observation was considered and corrected.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Title</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change to "biological control agents" because more than one fungus species was evaluated <p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Check if the phrase "third-instar nymphs, with LC50 estimate of 0.012" should be "third-instar nymphs, with LC50 estimated of 0.012" . 3. The phrase However is for contrast, and in my opinion is used inappropriate in the last two sentences. I suggest changing it for the term "Additionally, JAB07 was the most virulent isolate ..." or "We suggest, future field trials are required in ...". <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. At the beginning of the fourth paragraph is confusing the phrase "reported low control efficiency of <i>these pests</i> " because you are only talking about the white fly. <p>Material and Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Complete the geographical location of the faculty "Jaboticabal, Sao Paulo, Brazil" and Campinas, Sao Paulo. 6. Throughout all the text references of dilutions are exponential numbers but does not appear in superscript. Assured the final version has the correct format. 7. In the section Virulence of the entomopathogenic fungi isolates, in the first paragraph, specify the name of the selected isolates. 8. For section Statistical analysis, the phrase "<i>The results of nymphs mortality and eggs viability of B. tabaci biotype B</i> is incomplete?". <p>Results and Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. In the Tables 1 & 2, the specie <i>Metarhizium rileyi</i> is misspelled. 10. In the title of Table 1 nymphs is misspelled. 11. The same use of However (indicating contrast) can be change in the last paragraph of this section for terms like Additionally, Furthermore, Also. <p>Conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. Add the most prominent pathogenicity data of the study in this section. <p>References</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. Number 11, 18, 25, 26: Italic letters in scientific name of specie 14. Number 27: the term orchads is misspelled. 	<p>Title</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Indeed, the title is more explanatory according to the recommendation of the reviewer (Potential of entomopathogenic fungi as biological control agents of whitefly (<i>Bemisia tabaci</i> biotype B) (Genn.) (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae)). <p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. That's right, it must be: third-instar nymphs, with LC₅₀ estimated of 0.012. 3. The grammar and spelling were corrected. <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. At the beginning of the fourth paragraph, we referring to whitefly. 5. We just only work with eggs and nymphs, because the literature guides these methodologies, in addition, to allow a better manipulation of the pest, since in these stages it remains fixed. Furthermore, control methods in egg and nymphs stages is more efficient than adult stage. <p>Material and Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Was corrected the faculty geographical location. 7. All exponential numbers and superscripts were corrected. 8. The names of the isolates in the section were added "Virulence of the entomopathogenic fungi isolates". 9. The text was completed as: The results of the death and inability of nymphs and eggs of <i>B. tabaci</i> were previously corrected by the ABBOTT formula. <p>Results and Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. The name com was corrected: <i>Metarhizium rileyi</i>. 11. The title of the table was corrected: nymphs. 12. We consider the words Additionally, Furthermore, Also. <p>Conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. The conclusion of pathogenicity was added "The isolates JAB07 and IBCB18 of <i>B. bassiana</i> and LCMAP3790 of <i>L. muscarium</i> were the isolates that caused higher mortality of nymphs and eggs of <i>B. tabaci</i> biotype B. <p>References</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. The italic letters scientific name and the term "crops and orchards", were corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

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