



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_19511
Title of the Manuscript:	An Appraisal of the Upholding of Moral Good Actions by the Censor (44 BCE) in the Roman Empire and its Culmination in the Public Protector of South Africa
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This submission is hardly a finished piece. No valid abstract, no introduction, no running theme, no premiss, we do not know what would constitute "discussion," no worthy conclusion. The candidate's written English is rather poor; he does not seem to have sufficient mastery of the concepts which relate to the main issues of a submission like this one [whatever those issues are]. We would read a new version.	Suggestions have been implemented
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The quality of the English of the author should be improved upon	Text has been proof read
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		