



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_52601
Title of the Manuscript:	The Asian chestnut gall wasp in Italy: surveys on its native and exotic parasitoids as well as on chestnut cultivar susceptibility
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>This manuscript requires editing to correct mistakes and add missing values throughout. The introduction requires more background on chestnut tree justifying why it is important to control its pests. There is not enough information about the effect of Asian Chestnut Gall Wasp on chesnut tree and its level of infestation.</p> <p>There is not enough details on the climate and the type of forest where the study took place.</p> <p>The identification of emerged insects is not well documented. As writing now emerged insects were recorded and identified with taxonomic keys. The reference and methods are not precised.</p> <p>The table or figure presenting the average mean of cell per gall does not exist anywhere in the manuscript but author did some comments indicating, the mean number of cells per gall was not statistically the same among the three different cultivars (Analysis of Variance, $df = 2$, $F = 42.350$, $P < .001$).</p> <p>The rates of parasitism seem to be statistically similar between the cultivar trees. Basis on the results presented, authors used statistical test to compare Nerattino vs Pastinese then Carpinese vs (Nerattino + Pastinese). Why not Nerattino vs Pastinese, Carpinese vs Nerattino and Carpinese vs Pastinese ?</p> <p>The description of the statistical analysis lacks sufficient detail to understand on which cultivars the Asian chest nut Gall has a higher number of parasitoids especially for <i>T. sinensis</i>. Basis on the results of this study, the presence of native parasitoids is limited, while the exotic <i>T. sinensis</i> amounted by 84.27 % of all emerged parasitoids. Whitout statistical test, it would become difficult to tell whether the occurrence and activity of parasitoids (<i>T. sinensis</i>) are influenced by cultivar trees.</p> <p>Some of the Scientific names in the references are not italized and there are several mistakes.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>More details is needed on the importance of chestnut tree in the introduction.</p> <p>The name of lab where study took place must be mentioned</p> <p>Author needs to add Table or Figure presenting the average mean of cell per gall and describe the statistical method used to separate the means.</p> <p>Table 2 needs more details on the family and order of parasitoids species.</p> <p>Conclusion of this study should become clear if comparision is done between Nerattino vs Pastinese, Carpinese vs Nerattino and Carpinese vs Pastinese.</p> <p>References are too old and need to be updated</p>	
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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Patient Djidjonri Farsia</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Ngaoundéré, Cameroon</i>