

Reviewer's Comments

The authors have addressed the pesticide trials against DBM and their effect on its ant predator under lab and field conditions. The pest is serious in nature and inflicts heavy losses to many crops, thus the study is important. The write-up is largely OK, but still needs a bit of improvement in some places in terms of English or rephrasing. The data could be just enough to be published, although more can be done further. I, however, have a few concerns that need to be addressed before it gets published.

Major

1. Any possible explanation as to why bifenthrin works and deltamethrin doesn't against Plutella? Both are Pyrethroids, with little or no differences in mode of action if used in the same formulation.
2. If bifenthrin is giving you more than 80% mortality after 48h in lab and for 3 days in field, then the statement that bifenthrin doesn't work efficiently for Plutella doesn't seem right, as you have stated in your discussion (Lines 259-260). If it is causing more than 80% mortality, then calling it a resistance development may also be not correct. Three days duration I reckon is enough for a pesticide to work in the field. The increased persistence in the field on the other hand may also be looked at as environmental hazard, particularly in edible plants. The suggestion thus here is to rewrite this part of discussion.
3. Line 303 - Again contradictory to say that "bifenthrin showed high efficiency", whereas elsewhere stated that bifenthrin doesn't work. Correction needed.
4. The figures are a bit confusing and you have to switch over from the pest mortality figure to that of the predator to compare. It will be better to combine at least the first two figures, i.e., to plot Plutella mortality as bars and the Solenopsis mortality as a line graph over it for easy comparison of efficiency and safety of these insecticides. I reckon 9 and 7 treatments won't matter much in terms of plotting together.
5. The present bioassays were conducted under no choice test. Any Choice test to consider (in future) will be a good idea for Plutella or Solenopsis?
6. Finally, why only Solenopsis was considered? There are plenty of natural enemies, including parasitoids of Plutella to be considered. Is Solenopsis that much effective when compared to other natural enemies?

Minor

Line 46. Not only cast some doubt but for sure chemicals are threat to environmental safety

Lines 158-160: There is some confusion as the authors stated "*Each area received only one treatment that consisted of seven insecticides that caused mortality $\geq$ 80% for P. xylostella in the first bioassay: bifenthrin, chlorfenapyr, chlorantraniliprole, cyantraniliprole, indoxacarb, spinetoram and spinosad*" giving the impression that seven insecticides were used in each plot. I think the authors meant to say that each treatment consisted of either of the seven insecticides. This needs to be corrected.

Line 161-162: Again not very clear to me as written “In the case of *S. saevissima*, only those insecticides that caused mortality $\geq 30\%$ were used in the experiment:” Does it mean mortality to *S. saevissima* or *Plutella*? If it means mortality to the predator, then I reckon it should be less than 30% not more than 30%

Lines 282-283: “To preserve the populations of this natural enemy, these insecticides **should be used** considering the principles of ecological selectivity”. I think you should write instead “**should not be used**”