



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2015_AIR_18609
Title of the Manuscript:	A Retrospective Study of Cinara cupressivora Damage on Cupressus lusitanica Clonal Seed Orchard in Malawi between 1997 and 2003
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract Ok</p> <p>Introduction Ok</p> <p>Materials and methods Ok , only in the line 77 what means laments</p> <p>Results and discussion Ok Why 16.4% of total trees were dead?. Explain the causes.</p> <p>Conclusion ok</p> <p>Reference Ok, only line 198 check is organisation or organization I think is necessary add some photos</p>	<p>Done as recommended</p> <p>Done as recommended</p> <p>Correction done as recommended</p> <p>Unfortunately, there were no photos in the database</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study is good for many countries	