



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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 18 – Correct shows to show 2. Line 33 – The phrase should be recast as “ It has been estimated that the aphids cause an annual loss of.....” 3. Scientific names are written in full only for the first time. But subsequent appearance should carry initials of genus name and then the specific name, eg. C. cupressivora, C. lucitanica, etc. <p>Reference citations need to be revisited. The author has mixed up the system by mentioning the names as well as numbers. The citations should be recast so that only numbers appear in the text.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Suleiman
Department, University & Country	Department of Biology, Umaru Musa Yar'adua University, Katsina, Nigeria