

This study presents comprehensive data on the flight behavior of Agrilinae beetles. I was particularly impressed by the extensive dataset, which has significant value for pest management. The methods are scientifically sound. Introduction is easy to follow as well and no need to be revised. However, the manuscript contains some redundancy and is difficult to follow especially Results and Discussion part. I recommend reconsidering the presentation and summary of the results. My specific comments are as follows:

Tables and Figures: I believe that Table 2, which highlights the main findings, is essential. However, Figures 2-8 include a lot of unnecessary information. I suggest removing these figures or moving them to the Supplementary Materials unless they are crucial for discussing key aspects of beetle biology and management. For instance, is the latency to the first flight bout depicted in Fig. 2 critical? If so, please clarify its importance. Fig. 3 is quite difficult to read, and its relevance to the discussion is unclear. Fig. 4 either needs revision or should be removed. What key message are you trying to convey here? Consider focusing on biologically significant correlations and using scatterplots to represent them. For example, the strong correlations between total flight duration, total flight distance, and the number of flight bouts are fairly obvious and may not need detailed description in main text with figures. The sentences in lines 495-497 are unclear. I don't understand the logical connection between "the high correlation between the number of flight bouts and total distance flown" and "spreading by performing a series of short flights". I suggest emphasizing the importance of repeated short flight bouts leading to long distances covered, rather than the correlation between the number of flight bouts and total distance flown.

Figure 5: Some results in Fig. 5 are intriguing, but it's unnecessary to display all parameters for each species. Instead, select one or two representative parameters, such as the total flight distance for species with sufficient sample sizes. Scatterplots would be more informative than bar plots in this case.

Figure 6: The results in Fig. 6 should not be described as "Evolution" (line 415) since they reflect intra-generational changes. Consider revising the terminology.

Figures 7 and 8: It would be better to remove these figures unless you can clearly articulate their relevance to the discussion.

Additional Comment:

The sentences in lines 466-468 appear to rely on the outdated concept of "naïve group selection" (e.g., traits evolve for the benefit of the species). I recommend revising or removing these sentences to align with current evolutionary theory.

