

Reviewer 3- Point-by-point response.

Overall, this is a very valuable paper presenting a detailed approach for the development of new insecticides by blocking important digestive enzymes in a (relatively) taxon specific manner.

The writing is somewhat awkward in places, for example in the Abstract (lines 36-41) where the authors repeatedly state "We...". I'd suggest varying the construct somewhat for readability.

Response#1 We have edited the abstract as the reviewer suggested.

Line 122 "RNA later" should read "RNALater" (most likely an autocorrection error).

Response#2 Suggestion incorporated.

Line 127: "a single replicate" is an oxymoron.

Ans# We have five samples of transcriptome data, and all annotated DEs mapped it onto the RPW genome and identified the candidate DEs.

Lines 133 and 134 are incomplete or jumbled.

Response#3 Sentence revised: "Insects were anesthetized using CO2 for 1–2 min, and the abdomen and gut were carefully dissected (male and female separately) under a light microscope".

Line 140: "The HiSeq Illumina sequencing..." Does this refer to the instrument (e.g., HiSeq 2500) or to the sequencing chemistry? Were paired end reads done? or Single reads? What length?

Response#4 Sequencing model details updated. Paired ends reads were done. Rev#3 probably missed Table S1. All information was included in Table S1.

Line 174. I'm not sure what "correctly annotated". Can this be clarified or simply deleted?

Response#5 We meant "manually annotated." The sentence was revised.

Comments on the Quality of English Language

See above comments. The Abstract reads like it was machine-written, as do some sections of the Introduction. Some rephrasing would help the manuscript enormously.

Response#6 As suggested by rev#3, we have now rephrased the manuscript (track changes marked).